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CHAIR LE MONS: Good morning, California. Good morning, Commissioners. Welcome to Day three of our visualizations for the week of November 2nd through today. So today we're going to be addressing the congressional maps. And let me start with Ravi and get roll call, and we'll get down to business.

Ravi?

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. And before we start I just want to wish everybody a Happy Diwali.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here. And thank you.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: You're welcome.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?

(No response)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Turner?
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COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Vázquez?

COMMISSIONER VÁZQUEZ: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Fernández?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Presente.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: And Commissioner Le Mons?
CHAIR LE MONS: Here. Thank you.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: You have a quorum, Chair. You're welcome.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you so much. Okay. So let me give you a quick little overview of the day. We're scheduled to go until 5 tonight. We're going to start taking public comment around 3:30.

First of all, I want to thank all of the Californians who have called in over the last couple days. We've had robust feedback, and that is exactly what we need in order to do the job that we're here to do. So please continue to be engaged, and feel free to call in during the public comment segment.

Also we have a form on our website at WeDrawTheLinesCalifornia -- excuse me, ca, WeDrawTheLinesca.org, which you can also throughout the day submit public comment vis-à-vis the form. We are collecting that real time, and so you don't have to wait until 3:30 if you have a comment that you want to make, we encourage you to do so.

We have, over the last couple days, gotten through the assembly and senate visualizations. And today we're going to be focused on the congressional visualizations. So we're going to jump right in. I think we've had a wonderful pace, and got a lot of productive work done.

So let's continue that pace today. I'm going to
keep the same cadence that we had over the last couple
days where Commissioners, as we're working on a
particular or the visualization is being brought up, if
you have feedback on that visualization, you have
questions, feel free to raise your hand, and I'll call
upon you to provide that feedback or ask your questions
at that time.

You can also give direction if you're clear on a
direction that you want to give. And don't feel like if
you don't do it at that moment, you can't do it later.
So before we move on to another area of the state, I will
ask if there are any additional comments.

I think this flows a little better, and if we hold
to the end we're kind of jumping around, so I think that
this kind of helps with the conversation, and can give
commissioners the opportunity to hear from one another
about very specific areas of the state as we are doing
those particular visualizations. So I hope that's worked
for everyone. I know if it doesn't, you guys will
message me and let me know.

So with that, we're going to go on and get started.
I will turn it over to Karin. Is Karin here? There you
go. Hi Karin. Good morning.

MS. MACDONALD: Good morning, Chair Le Mons, and
good morning, Commissioners. Thank you so much for
having us back.

We are going to start with Kennedy, who is going to start sharing her map. And we'll start going through the congressional districts, if that works for you, Chair Le Mons. And then after that we'll move over to Tamina.

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes, that works. Thank you.

MS. MACDONALD: Thank you so much. And, Kennedy, map looks good. Take it away.

MS. WILSON: Hello. Good morning. We're going to start in the Central Valley with these two yellow districts here that Mr. Becker may want to comment on after I describe them. This is going to start on page 38. This Kings, Tulare, Bakersfield is page 38. And while you're getting there, I'll also explain some other things that are going on. These green dots here are the old congressional district lines. This first number at the top is deviation. Then we have Latino CVAP, Black CVAP, Asian CVAP, White CVAP, and Indigenous CVAP. And that's the same for both of these labels I'll be going through.

So I will start in Bakersfield, in this dollop/scoop, whatever you like to call it. And again, it is the same as what I've been showing you before as far as what communities are in there, but I will just continue to explain those and tell you that.
Arvin, Lamont, Cottonwood, Benton Park, Fairfax, East Niles, Hillcrest, and La Cresta all make it in here, among others. And so then we go up and we have Shafter, which is not split, we have McFarland, Delano, and Wasco as well. And then moving up into Kings and Tulare, this takes an approach where it kind of cuts it in the middle, and Tulare is on one side, no split. We have Porterville also not split as well as Lindsay.

Before, in previous visualizations we had Corcoran split, this is not split in these visualizations as well. And that is the spesh (ph.) district. And again, if Mr. Becker wishes to comment, he can.

MR. BECKER: I don't have a lot to say about this, this is only slightly underpopulated, so keep an eye on that. You've got some room to add some population if you wish. And based on the racially polarized voting patterns we've seen here, this is definitely an area where the Voting Rights Act is relevant. And based on some of the testimony we've also heard, I think this is probably very comfortably presented as a visualization district where Latinos would likely have an opportunity to elect candidates of their choice. And there's probably a little bit of flexibility even to lower the Latino CVAP slightly if you so chose.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Ahmad?
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair, can we just announce the page number for these?

MS. WILSON: You're muted.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I'm sorry. Can you hear me?

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes, now we can.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. Can you announce the page numbers for these visualizations?

MS. WILSON: Yes. This one starts on page 38, and the next one will be on page 39, but this is 38 for this one.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. You can continue.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So now I will move on to page --

CHAIR LE MONS: I'm sorry, sorry to interrupt you, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: No, it's okay.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernández?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Kennedy and David I -- the little dollop, as Kennedy says, we've reached -- that is attached because of the VRA consideration, correct?

MS. WILSON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Okay.

MS. WILSON: For purposes of getting it -- oh, yeah. Sorry?

CHAIR LE MONS: Kennedy, just to confirm, that is
a -- that is an area of concentration of Latino voters, yes?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: And I also would like to mention about both of these taking in your consideration from last time, they were -- they looked different, and they were going more north to south. And again, I'll just that you asked me to take a more east-west approach with Kings and Tulare. And you asked for me not to have a C-shape here, but to go down in this way, and so that is also a part of the construction of these districts.

But now I will move on to page 39, titled FRESNOTULARE, so I'll move up there. And here we have Visalia, Exeter, Ivanhoe, Woodlake, and I know that this will probably come up about adding Three Rivers. It does bring down the CVAP slightly, but it's also something that I can explore in my next visualization to bring it in as well. Lemoore and Hanford are kept together here, there is no split into Merced, it just goes Dos Palos is kept with Merced, and there's no crossing that county line.

And we have -- I'm going to zoom in so we can see here that Reedley, Orange Cove, Kingsburg, Selma, Parlier, Del Rey, Sanger all kept together, these farming
cities. And then I'm going to go into Fresno. And I dip into most of the visualizations for -- there's a concentration of Latino CVAP here, so that's why most of my visualizations in Fresno take up this area, up to Mayfair, which you -- if you look back on the other ones, you'll see they all have this.

But I changed the splits in a way to try to keep Sunnyside, Old Fig Garden, West Park, Southwest Fresno together, so that's why it has this configuration. And I know we've been talking about the Hmong community, which I have more of those COIs now, and we'll implement keeping those together better in my next visualizations that I have for you next week too, but this is why it has that kind of carveout there.

And again, FRESNOTULARE deviation, Latino CVAP, Black CVAP, Asian CVAP, White CVAP, and Indigenous CVAP. And if Mr. Becker wishes to comment, he may as well, too. And I will zoom out so you can see it on a broader scope as well.

MR. BECKER: I'd only note that as you consider your directions to the line drawers, this is at the upper end of negative deviation. It's at the upper end of underpopulation. So if you're going to do anything, you probably have to add population here. And the Latino CVAP here is significantly lower, still we're seeing
strong VRA considerations in this area.

I don't think this is a level that would raise concerns about Latinos' opportunity to elect candidates of their choice, but probably doesn't allow a lot of flexibility to go significantly lower than that.

MS. WILSON: Thank you. And so that is done for these yellow districts. And with your permission, I will go on to the rest of the districts.

CHAIR LE MONS: Please do.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So now we are going to move on to page 36, which is titled MADERAKERN. And I'm going to turn off these congressional lines and make the titles -- so it just has the title and the deviation. There we go.

So here we have what's left of Kern. And in Tulare we have fat (ph.) Three Rivers which I can explore putting it in here as well, which it does -- we'll bring down CVAP, and I can explore that. We have into Fresno just the Clovis and Northeastern Fresno areas, and this Eastern Fresno part. And then we have up to Madera as well, the mountain parts of Oakhurst, Yosemite lakes.

And and from last time it reached farther north, but I moved things around in Fresno so that it can populate this more, so that I could take out Mariposa, Tuolomne to be with Calaveras.

And so then moving on, we're going to go to page 35,
which has Merced and Fresno, it's here in red. And I'm going to zoom in closer. We have Merced whole, which to try and minimize splits I do have three splits here of the City of Fresno. However, again, I would like to note from previous direction it does keep Clovis and Northeast Fresno together, and Sunnyside, Old Fig Garden, West Park, Southwest Fresno, and this Northwest Fresno.

Again, I will have to look closer into consideration with the Hmong communities, and their shapefiles, but that that is why it takes this configuration trying to keep those communities together.

And then going into Madera, we have, you know, at the Foothills it cuts off. We have the City of Madera, Madera Acres, Chowchilla, Fairmead, and then again Merced whole.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari?

Before your comment, Mr. Becker, did you want to add something?

MR. BECKER: Yeah, I just wanted to note this was an area where there were significant VRA considerations, going up from -- into Merced, and even a little bit of Stanislaus.

Kennedy, could you put the CVAPs up on this again? I believe this is at around 46 percent Latino CVAP?

MS. WILSON: I will put those -- I'll put the Latino
CVAP on, and you will see that now.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. So again, slightly underpopulated. Something to think about are -- there are potential Voting Rights Act considerations here. There was strong racially-polarized voting that went all the way up from Kern County into this Merced, and even leading into the southern part of Stanislaus County a little bit. So this might be an area where direction might be appropriate to further reflect those considerations.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thanks, Kennedy. If you can kind of zoom out, so we can see all four of these districts that you've been talking about, just kind of want to look at this sort of big picture like -- so as you mentioned, last time the districts were running more north to south, and we asked for east to west, and this is what we've come up with.

It seems like last time Fresno and Bakersfield were together in the previous -- is that correct, Fresno and Bakersfield were together last time too in the previous iteration?

(No response)

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Yeah, we're getting
a lot of input on that, and feedback. But in order -- so I have a couple things, I mean, it seems to me, and just correct me if I'm wrong, if we want to split Bakersfield and Fresno, we would just be blowing up kind of the entire state, if you will, at this point. And the ripple effect would be --

MS. WILSON: It would be large due to the fact that --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. Yeah, both yeah. That would be large just because, you know, this alone, Tulare/Kern alone without this population in Fresno is not enough. So it would leak.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right, leak significantly, so we either have to go east to the -- or west to the coast, or east into San Bernardino, or south into -- you know, L.A. with Kern. And with Fresno I think -- I mean, we'd be taking Mono, Inyo, Mariposa, Tuolumne, and heading north significantly, right? I mean, because you took out those two counties, Tuolumne and Mariposa, and the district didn't change that much, you know --

MS. WILSON: And I -- yeah, and I had to change --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right.

MS. WILSON: -- in the Fresno to give more population in Fresno as well.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right, right, right, but just kind of understanding the big picture tradeoffs here. I mean, if we want to split Bakersfield and Fresno, we'd be taking a huge -- you know, we'd be taking either a huge chunk of the eastern part of the state to fill out the population or we'd be going into the red district there, which we kind of want to sort of see, I would imagine, if we can make that a VRA district somehow.

The other observation I have is that these districts are all short, and so, you know, we need to get these really close to zero, so it looks like in KINGSTULARE we're -- I don't have my numbers off the top of my head, I would say 14,000 short. In FRESNOTULARE we're somewhere in the neighborhood of 35,000 short. I mean, it's like 700,000 to 800,000, right, per district.

So we've got to add in this whole area. And so I guess a process question for us, in general, with the group is do we have feeling about how we're going to move forward with these congressional districts? Are we going to anchor on the VRA districts, and try to get those close and then move out from there? We've got VRA districts in the very southern part of the state, in the central part of the state and so we need to be making some progress on zeroing in on that.
And I don't know that we have a process in place to figure that out. I mean, I'll just share my thoughts. It seems to me it would make sense to anchor on our VRA districts, get those close in population, and then work out from there.

But another question that we haven't sort of come to a conclusion on -- we've got a week or so to finish these maps, or, you know, get draft maps out. And where do we want to be with our draft maps? I mean, do we want to be really super close, you know, or still have some wiggle room? And I'm kind of open either way on that.

So I just -- I want to just look at the big picture here and share some thoughts. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think the two questions you're asking are really critical, Commissioner Fornaciari, and I haven't thought about the second one, but on the first one I definitely feel -- well, maybe it answers the second one, but I would like us to be pretty comfortable about our VRA districts, and that we feel like we've gotten close to what they need to be.

And if we have wiggle room, it would be some of the other pieces, we may need to still change our VRA, I'm not saying that, but I would like to see us anchor in
that. And I keep feeling like instead of doing a whole region, just really understanding the VRA first, and then going back and doing regions like we've been doing, would be helpful.

But I agree with you that the -- well, I don't know if you were agreeing yet, ask the question. So I would say I would like to see us get more solid on the VRA districts.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernández?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

And thank you for this conversation.

Yes, I agree with the VRA trying to get those nailed down better to use as anchors. But then also I -- Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned that, you know, we wanted more of an east to west, but I mean as I look at this, it's still a north to south type of configuration, and I know we don't want to do it, but like currently the MADERAKERN district is negative.

And I know we don't want to put Inyo with Tulare, and those districts, but it -- sometimes it might make sense, because Inyo has just under 19,000 population, and at least it would be a smaller district per se, in terms of size in miles instead of, you know, 400 miles from one end to the other, so that those are things that we're
going to have to grapple with.

And then also with the current visualization that we're on, which is the MERCEDFRESNO, if we can further reflect VRA considerations, as David Becker said, it is very close, it's 40 -- just under 46 percent for the Latino CVAP. I would like to see that as well. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN? Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari, for bringing this up. Yeah, I believe we do -- should look at the VRA and all of the -- also VRA, not just these -- like we have two, but we have a third one in here, we should look at VRA areas, and pin those down, I'd say, within like 1 percent at this point. And then in terms of population elsewhere, we can leave that in terms of areas that we'd like to have together, realizing that then we can get input from the public and work on those.

The one thing I know we got a lot of feedback about, the Fresno to Kern, and where we go that way. And the one thing I -- you know, we are a north-south state, we have mountains, we have a valley, we have mountains on the other side. And they might be by an airplane closer, but if you can't get there, it doesn't matter. I know
like Tulare -- well, Inyo's right next door, it's 18,000 people, but you can't get there in the winter. Actually you can't sort of get there unless -- there's only a couple of roads up and over.

And so it is hard, which is why, you know, Inyo was with San Bernardino before, which we might end up doing. You know, I want us to keep that in mind as we are trying to go east-west. I know it would look nicer on the map, but again, you can't necessarily get there.

Now, I don't think just in terms of the VRA, we're looking here at the Central Valley, I think we should look at all of them, because as we go, does Kern go down to L.A., but we're working in L.A. going up. So I think we should consider that. And how does San Benito area fit into all of this? So I would like us to see that.

Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vázquez?

COMMISSIONER VÁZQUEZ: Thank you. An additional perspective, I think I'm agreeing with most of the comments that I think we probably for congressional districts are going to need to maintain this north-south perspective.

I think, for me, one perspective I wanted to add to this conversation and our considerations is that the congressional districts, especially in these areas, are,
as Mr. Becker said yesterday, reminded us yesterday, these are huge -- these are going to be huge districts as well. And for me, in terms of the population, in order for them to be more compact in our eyes, if we're considering, you know, how far one may need to travel from one end of a congressional district to the other, in order to make those more compact, we'd have to start breaking up some of the bigger cities within the Central Valley, which is also something that we have heard feedback not to do to a certain extent.

And so for me it seems to make more sense from a community of interest perspective, honestly, to make a large congressional district knowing that geographically it may be a huge district, but, you know, elected officials make that work. They have field offices, they have field reps, and I also think Commissioner Sinay made a really important perspective that I'm not sure we can solve for down in San Diego.

But if we end up pulling population from a more densely populate area in the Central Valley, we pretty much guarantee that that is where the elected official is going to be from in each election, whereas in some of these -- in a really geographically large congressional district that doesn't have sort of a densely populated area, we actually open the field more and I think,
potentially, broaden the perspective of an elected official to have to be more responsive to less densely populated areas, which is sort of the point.

So for me, I'm less concerned about sort of how geographically big, because I think that's an administrative practical problem that an elected official will have to solve in order to be responsive to the entire congressional district.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: I just wanted to make a quick point because -- and it's along the lines of what Commissioner Vázquez just said. First of all, the -- yes, very large districts again, so that's a key element. And also because equal population is the very top criteria is going to come into play here on these congressional districts, there will be more splits of those criteria for considerations in congressional districts. Cities will be split, counties will definitely be split. There's no way to avoid that because we are going down to the block level to get to as close to equal population as is reasonably practicable.

So when you're thinking about these, what I suggested is just to -- by the way these are -- the line drawers have done an outstanding job, these are very
compact districts, they do a very good job of maintaining
criteria for considerations. They're doing as well as
they can, trying to get to VRA considerations, those
kinds of things.

But again, the equal population considerations here
are going to be more difficult to meet than in other
districts because you have to get close to equal
population. So as you're thinking about it, my
suggestion is deprioritize some of the criteria for
considerations here a little more and maybe give
direction that help get closer to that equal population
number because you're going to need to get there
eventually anyway.

As you're prioritizing next -- to just get Voting
Rights Act consideration, next contiguity, which is
already handled quite nicely here, and then finally
getting down to criteria four.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Before we go to Commissioner
Fornaciari, I want commissioners to ponder. It seems
like there's been some desire, and I don't have a sense
of how universal it is, but quite a bit of desire to
maybe look more carefully at the VRA districts and nail
those. If that ends up being the consensus of the
Commission, then I would call for a brief closed session
on the pending litigation so that we can address those
issues more specifically.

So I want you to be thinking about that because I don't have that scheduled as of right now, but we certainly could make arrangements to do that. So I'll kind of gauge, as I hear additional feedback, where we are on that, and before the break we'll make a decision on how, if that's necessary, it'll impact our schedule and whether or not we want to do that prior to going through the rest of the visualizations. So we need to be thinking about that.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, a few things. I think Commissioner Vázquez's point is really, really well, -- well thought out. And I agree. I think, you know, if we -- we have some huge areas with sparse population, and if we put one city with it, then that city's going to run, or one major population area is going to control it. But, you know, so if we can -- if there's a possibility to do that, it's going to be really tough in the Central Valley, but in other parts of the state maybe we can do that. But we should try.

I want to thank our line drawers for all their hard work. They've done a heck of a job. I do have one question though. I'm not sure I asked you, Kennedy, but I'd ask to kind of look at if San Benito, kind of, Merced
combo might work. Did you all have a chance -- I know it's been quick turnaround.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. I --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: But I don't know if you had a chance to look at that.

MS. WILSON: And so I don't think -- you must not have been here yesterday, but that was put into the senate with -- but putting it in San Benito kind of threw off a total deviation for me and Tamina --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

MS. WILSON: -- in congressional, so we didn't put it in these ones, but we did put it in with the congressional -- I mean with the senate district.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Okay. Sorry I missed some of yesterday. I appreciate that, thank you.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. And, you know, if I were to take it in, it would just mean like spitting more things out to -- spitting is not probably a good word -- but giving more things to Tamina's area, maybe up north, and there's a lot of restrictions there as well, so -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, it seems we've got to pull in from somewhere to get the -- I mean, we're short throughout the valley, throughout the seven valleys, so we have got to pull in from somewhere, and that's going to spit out somewhere else. So I think we
need to be open. Thanks.

    MS. WILSON: Uh-huh. And we can definitely explore that --

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

    MS. WILSON: -- for next time around too.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I want to plus one what Commissioner Vázquez just said. I absolutely agree. I think we had a similar conversation about the very southern portion of the state in the Imperial Valley, and the size of that particular district, and how large it is. I also want to note that in reading through, again, some of the additional COI testimony that we've received, individuals who are writing in and calling in from smaller communities are all saying similar things to what Commissioner Vázquez did also say.

    In particular, we also heard that loud and clear from the Eastern Sierra communities who felt that when they were combined with larger cities that their elected officials tended to come from those larger cities, and they felt very ignored. So I would absolutely be in support of what Commissioner Vázquez did say.

    I also want to note that we did receive some COI testimony, at least one that I have pulled up right now,
also noted that while combining Bakersfield and Fresno are not ideal, it's preferable to taking Bakersfield down into San Bernardino, Riverside, or going across into the mountainous areas as well too.

So while we heard quite a bit yesterday, I think we're -- there's differences of opinion obviously, as we've seen through all of our COI testimony. I'm also -- perhaps this is an additional consideration. I'm looking at the FRESNOTULARE visualization, that has the largest deviation right now of the VRA districts that we're looking at on the map here. Maybe as a -- as from a process point of view, maybe we start there as a way to reduce that deviation so that we can get a little closer to equal population.

And to me, Kennedy, I know you answered Commissioner Fornaciari's question about San Benito, but I'm wondering if maybe this is where we have to start breaking up counties and perhaps looking at creating a longer coastal district so that then we can go a little bit westward as well as eastward to pick up some of that population that's going to be needed, without putting the VRA considerations into jeopardy.

I don't know, I'm just, you know, thinking about that in terms of, you know, hearing some of the conversations and the various options that we have to
consider. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you. I agree with much of what has been said already. And so I just wanted to clarify some direction to the line drawers. And I think this is consistent with what most have been saying. I think as we are thinking about the next stage which is going to be live line drawing starting on Sunday, what would be really helpful is to have these VRA districts, I'm pretty comfortable with the general direction we're moving here, but to drill those down and have them closer to that equal population plus or minus 1 percent deviation.

I think certainly, as Mr. Becker outlined, we have some responsibilities in the Merced/Madera region as well, and we're potentially overpopulated with the Latino CVAP in Kings, in particular the Kings/Kern kind of configuration. So for direction, you know, solidifying those as close as possible before we take a second look at this in live line drawing I think would be extraordinarily helpful.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I would
also like to solidify those sooner rather than later, in closed session if needed. You know the deviation in FRESNOTULARE is just so large, I mean, we really need to get that much closer to zero, and to get that right, otherwise all our work around it, you know, is just going to have to get changed anyway. So definitely want to get those down first, the two VRA districts.

About Commissioner Vázquez's point about lightly populated areas being combined with larger cities, and how that affects possible candidates, I think philosophically I certainly agree, and I think it's great to maybe frame that as communities of interest for more lightly populated areas, but to be a little bit careful about talking about where candidates come from because we are supposed to be officially agnostic about that.

Now, it's mostly about actual -- you know, actual candidates and incumbents and so forth, but even speaking of theoretical ones I think we should be -- just be a little more careful about that. Thanks.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. I was forgetting which button again. So on Fresno we split it -- Fresno City, we split it three ways, and was that mainly for population reasons or?

MS. WILSON: Population and just direction I've been
given to keep certain communities together, like west --
you know, if I show you here, we have Sunnyside, West
Park, Old Fig Garden, west of the 99, there's a lot that
take in a different way. And so, you know, this, you
know, will starting to bring in Sunnyside brings down the
Latino CVAP a lot as well, so trying to carve those out
to keep them together, but also keep this at a reasonable
number. And then to keep this at a reasonable number
within five, so that drives a lot of that as well as
trying to follow the -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Gotcha. And where's Selma? I
know I've asked this before.

MS. WILSON: Selma is right above Kingsburg, right
here, as I'm circling.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay, I see it now, yeah.

MS. WILSON: There you go.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So Fresno, Sunnyside, Selma,
and Sanger, we weren't able to keep those together?

MS. WILSON: No. But I was also told Sunnyside, Old
Fig Garden, and West Park, were communities of interest
that wanted to stay together as well.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right, so we have -- yeah, we
have two competing communities of interest. Gotcha. All
right. And then the other piece, just thinking about
where do we get population, and this isn't going to make
it any -- I don't think this is going to help that much, but the Sierras has been really interesting getting some of the communities of -- you know, reading some of their input.

And the east side of the Sierras feels very different from the west side. And, you know, the east side -- the East Slope, as they call it, the East Slope does have more access than the West Slope, but if we were to, you know, start moving into the West Slope to connect it with some of these areas, that would mean even a longer, narrower district going all the way up kind of, but I just -- I did want to bring that up.

In looking at Inyo -- oh, it is a small county. It's also a majority white -- it's not as diverse as other parts of San Bernardino and Riverside so -- but, you know, that's neither here nor there. I think we do need to -- we did receive a lot of input from San Benito saying keep us with the coast, don't put us with the Central Valley, but if it has to be, it has to be.

I strongly support looking at the possibility of having a third -- you know, meeting our obligations and our responsibility for the Madera area just because, you know, this part is -- it's really important.

I am kind of concerned about splitting up Fresno three times. If -- you know, this is an area that has
felt disenfranchised in the past. Do we increase that feeling by splitting up their center so much? And I don't know the area well enough, and obviously I can't speak for the individuals there, it's just maybe a philosophical question that I have. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. I appreciate the conversation, and I just wanted to say, particularly from the line drawer's perspective, I believe there's -- the congressional district has to be plus or minus a couple of people. So these are the maps that I believe the line drawers should really try to focus in on, what can they do, how can they do to really get these numbers really close. And that will allow us to consider them, you know, other hard changes we'll have to do on the assembly and the senate, but you know, again, certain areas have congressional issues and certain areas have -- they're more just strictly state issues. So I think that might help a little bit. So I think this getting down to right now before next week work on the congressional districts to be trimmed, to be really close in percentage wise, deviation wise. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. So I just wanted to express that I am very comfortable with this
architecture, and many of us on the call today are expressing support for the architecture for this -- for these districts, particularly the north-south approach.

And I would be supportive of prioritizing our time on trying to get the VRA districts a little bit more solidified, not just in the Central Valley but across the state of California and to try to get to closer deviation levels -- acceptable levels of deviation for these districts.

And I think important and it's -- for (indiscernible) on giving the line drawers some flexibility, especially around the communities of interest criteria in terms of county lines, city lines, some of the other communities of interest considerations.

And in particular, specifically to this region, to the three areas with VRA considerations that we are able to solidify them, so that the (indiscernible) district surrounding them can be developed a little bit more concretely as we go into line drawing. I think it will make our line drawing process hopefully less difficult.

Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry, I misspoke, and I meant to say the Merced/Fresno area, not the Madera. So
I apologize.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernández?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Yes. Thank you. And I think I've said it before, but I do agree that the VRA needs to be solidified first because any other changes we request, it's almost for naught because we're just -- I don't want to say we're going to go in circles, but once we solidify that, it's like the major puzzle pieces, that's how I like to see it, I don't want to say the rest will be easier to do, but at least we know what we have left to work with. So, yes, please concentrate on the VRA. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. I want to check in with the commissioners. I am hearing quite a bit of consensus around needing to focus on VRA. I think we do need to go into closed session to discuss VRA considerations in the CEntral Valley under the pending litigation exception.

So it's just a question of when because I feel like we could spend up until the break echoing that sentiment or we could take a break and go into closed session, a brief closed session, we probably wouldn't need more than 15 to 30 minutes to do that, and then come back and continue with the visualizations, or we could go into closed session after our first break.
So I'm open. So I'd like to hear from a couple folks their thoughts.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: It almost seems like we may want to consider going into closed session sooner rather than later just to figure out the (indiscernible) how to allocate our time for the rest of the remainder of the day to bring those questions.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, awesome. And I saw enough heads to feel very comfortable going in that direction.

Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: I was just going to suggest that I'm very happy to go to closed session to discuss the Voting Rights Act considerations in this area of the map under the pending litigation exception. I think it would be a fairly short discussion, and I think the commissioners have expressed an interest in resolving those issues first, because I think they will largely define how some of the other districts are drawn, are quite right (ph.). So I think that that could be useful probably sooner rather than later.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So let me just check in with Kristian. Kristian, can you send a link?

MR. MANOFF: Sure thing. You should already have links in your inbox.
CHAIR LE MONS: Oh, look at that. Thank you so much. I appreciate that.

So with that, let's go on and go into closed session now. It's 10:18, so let's come back at 10:40, at 10:40 -- let's make it 10:45. So we'll come back at 10:45, and continue. Okay?

(Off the record at 10:17 a.m.)

(On the record at 11:15 a.m.)

CHAIR LE MONS: All right. Welcome back, everyone.

Let's continue where we left off.

Kennedy, you want to continue please? Oh, I'm sorry. I do need to -- I think I need to announce that, you know, we're coming back from closed session based on litigation consideration, and there was no action taken. With that, Kennedy, let's proceed.

MS. WILSON: Okey dokey. So I believe we left off from the Merced/Madera to Fresno, which was on page 35. And we're going to continue moving north in the Central Valley to Stanislaus --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm sorry. Excuse me. Chair, I actually had my hand up before we went to the closed session. I still would like to comment on that area.

CHAIR LE MONS: I'm sorry. Thank you, Commissioner Turner. Please go ahead.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Kennedy, in the Fresno --
MERCEDFRESNO area --

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- we are a little bit under there. I would love to see if we could split Stanislaus, taking in a lot of the cities on the left -- towards the west, the Crow's Landing, Diablo Grande, perhaps not Patterson, I think Patterson may be too much, but if we can explore adding in population into Stanislaus. And of course Stanislaus was already over, and so for Stanislaus looking at removing French Camp and perhaps Lathrop, so just pushing that up some to balance out some of the numbers if the CVAP works. That's it, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: Oh, yes, sorry. I nodded my head, yes, understood.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you, Kennedy. I think to also offer up some additional flexibility for that MERCEDFRESNO visualization, I'd like to ask you to also look at going into San Benito County and, yeah, particularly like that northern part, Hollister/Ridgemark that I see on that menu -- not menu -- map that you're showing us.

Yeah, I'd like to just also add that direction to give additional flexibility. If it's better to go into
San Benito to gain additional population, I'd like you to do that. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: You're welcome. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah, Kennedy, could you lower a little bit, go a little further south please, so we can see the numbers in each of these?

Yeah, we have all of these -- the VRA areas here, or potential VRAs, are a little low, and if you could explore equaling out that population, whether it be, you know, grab you a little bit more up into -- from KINGSTULARE, grab a little bit more up into FRESNOTULARE, and then FRESNOTULARE, rearrange Fresno a little bit, that area, to grab a little bit more, or wherever we need to.

Then I'd like to actually see you do Stanislaus first before you cross over the mountains into San Benito because that is a difficult area for people to get across, where going up to Stanislaus is easier please, or even if you need to go a little bit more down into the MADERAKERN section to grab population. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I agree with -- exactly with what Commissioner Andersen said. We
do need to -- you know, we're at negative on deviation, and so it is about both let's get closer to zero as well as making sure we're keeping kind of the CVAP -- Latino CVAP, you know, similar across, and giving opportunities. I agree with going into southwest Stanislaus County, you know, first and then into San Benito. And if, you know, moving things kind of to the north, if that affects MADERAKERN, you know, just move the north boundary of MADERAKERN south if possible just to keep making that one a little more compact, if need be. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner. Did you have another comment, Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No thanks.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

Please continue, Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: Okay. So now continuing to move north, we are going to be on page 34. And here, clearly things will change, but here we have Stanislaus, keeping Modesto/Turlock together, as well as Manteco, Lathrop, Mountain House, and Tracy. There is this northeastern corner taken out from Oakdale to Knights Ferry that was put in with the Eastern California due to population concerns.

And I will continue moving north. And next we will
be on page 32, which has the SSACNSANJOAQ area, and this keeps Ripon, Escalon, Farmington, Peters, Linden all together, this does keep Stockton whole. It is paired with Lodi, Galt, and Elk Grove, which I know to try to keep moving up north, which might be helpful to take some of these things out, and to keep pushing up north, so that this can move north as well. But that's what is together now, Elk Grove and Vineyard in this one.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Kennedy, also you need to remove, we need to get rid of population here. Some of the cities, some of those unincorporated areas are census designated places in the -- yep, right there, could perhaps also go into the other -- down into the blue as well, the Escalon, Farmington, Peters, even Linden, down with Salida, Ripon, all of those, Riverbank, so we can add those into the Stanislaus to reduce population.

MS. WILSON: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I agree with Commissioner Turner. And I just wanted to add Oakdale, that that was one of the community of interest, public calls was Escalon, Ripon, and Oakdale, and the other ones that she mentioned, if we need to.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernández?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And, Kennedy, thank you. I can see -- I can tell you know exactly where I was going go with this. So, yeah, I think the more we -- I guess the south pushes up, we start getting closer to that -- the Galt and above. So I've already voiced my wishes on the different assembly and senate, and it's pretty much the same. So I don't need to repeat it, right, Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: We're good.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: You've got it, right?

MS. WILSON: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner, did you have another comment?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I did, thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Also, Kennedy, an awful lot of testimony to attempt to keep Mountain House and Tracy with Stockton, which are both large populations, but I'm hoping if we do that, there's a way to give flexibility for Commissioner Fernández's request up towards the top end as well.

MS. WILSON: Thank you. We'll look at that.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.
CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Kennedy, you can proceed please.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So next we will continue on to Sacramento which is on page 31. And a previous visualization had West Sacramento in it, and these running north, but I removed Yolo completely and Sacramento is -- the City of Sacramento is kept whole. Let me zoom in. And it has Florin, Fruitridge Pocket, down to Parkway all together, as well as Rosemont, La Riviera, Mather, and Rancho Cordova. And, again, this was on page 31, I missed that, the purple area, and Elverta to the north. And now --

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner --

MS. WILSON: I'm sorry.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernández?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Yes, yes, thank you. Thank you with that, Kennedy. And I think it's just going to be the ripple effect, and I have given direction in the past, but I want to ensure that when we do the ripple effects that we do try to keep some -- do as much as possible to keep our communities of interest together with the Elk Grove Vineyard, the Florin, Lemon Hill, all those areas, we try to keep those together as we move up, and we continue to try to bring some of those areas like Carmichael, Arden Arcade, Fair Oaks into the Greater
Sacramento.

Thank you, Kennedy.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I wanted to echo what Commissioner Fernández said. I do have a question. In terms of the COI input, I did see several COI input about AAPI COI testimony around Greenhaven as a COI, and there were several requests to be kept together with Elk Grove.

I also saw testimony about Rancho Cordova, perhaps being with other communities, I was thinking -- you haven't gotten there, but -- being put into the PLACERSAC visualization.

So my direction is if it's possible to at least combine Greenhaven and Elk Grove together, and then possibly moving Rancho Cordova into the PLACERSAC visualization up there. And then to offset that, move Folsom down into the SSACNSJOAQ visualization. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernández, do you have another comment?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: I did have another, but now that Commissioner Akutagawa mentioned Folsom with the SSACNSJOAQ, I would be really, really against that. Sorry. But I do -- I appreciate you reminding me about
the Greenhaven, and Elk Grove, and Folsom I'd like to keep up with the El Dorado and Granite Bay Area. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes, as the Sacramento line moves south to incorporate parts of the Sacramento/Stanislaus -- Sacramento Joaquin area, I would like to see the PLACERSAC grab -- or also move south, but grabbing part of that Natomas area which is to the west in the Sacramento area. And then the portion that's -- as the PLACERSAC line area moves south, that extra population I would like to see move into the east -- Eastern California, ECA area. I think that would help balance out our population issues. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm worried for the line drawers because we're all over the place with some of this direction it feels like. I just want to uplift again. I think a lot of what's going to come out of the Central Valley VRA districts is going to have a larger ripple effect in the Sacramento area. So for me my direction is exploratory in nature.

I think Commissioner Turner had mentioned some of the swaps that might start happening between San Joaquin and the Stanislaus border down below with Tracy and
Mountain House, and we received a whole bunch of testimony in that region.

I think depending on what happens there, right, so if that Tracy, Mountain House, and Manteca I think it was -- in fact I would need to go back to the testimony that we've received -- starts shifting north towards with San Joaquin, based on those ripples from Central Valley, I think it might open up an opportunity to relink Elk Grove back in with Lemon Hill, which was some of the -- and Meadowview with Elk Grove, I think, which was some of the -- and Florin, which was some of the COI testimony that we've received from that area, and keeping those together.

But again, to me this is all based on that ripple, right, like that the Central Valley is our anchor, and then moving northward. But those are changes that I would be very -- I would certainly welcome seeing. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. And thank you for your framing of that, that's excellent. Because I know we're trying to get a little bit more specific in the direction, and tell what's optional and -- very well done, thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you.
Commissioner Sadhwani. I think that that's true. So my direction now is going to be just noting COIs that I noted. So there was several COI testimonies about -- and I think Commissioner Fernández may have said this, and I apologize if I blanked out on this, but -- Rosemont, La Riviera, and Arden-Arcade I believe there was comments, COI comments, or testimony to keep those together, if they can be kept together in whatever ripple effects will happen to the district. Same with keeping, I think, Vineyard with Elk Grove, together with that Greenhaven area.

Also on the Rancho Cordova, I also noted that Mather and Rancho Cordova want to also stay together as a potential COI. So I think just to give you flexibility in terms of where it ends up, I just wanted to note those COIs too to ensure that we keep them together. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

You can continue, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So now moving north to the screen area we were talking about, we are on page 30, PLACERSAC. Previously heard keeping Arden-Arcade and Carmichael together, so I hadn't split those up, keeping Orangevale more to this -- keeping Orangevale in Sacramento instead of putting it northward, and then we
have Antelope and Rose Hill together, as well as with Citrus Heights. And then we have Rocklin, and in the previous visualization Lincoln was pushed north, and I now have moved it back so that it's connected to Rocklin and Roseville in this visualization here.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?
Commissioner Fernández?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: I'm just going to do the whole -- I believe the whole ripple effect is probably going to address what my directions are going to be, and I know that Kennedy already knows what it is of trying to loop in Folsom, El Dorado Hills, and Granite Bay into this area. But I think that may naturally happen. So it's really hard -- I'm teetering on giving direction and not giving direction. But as it ripples, and I believe I've given enough consistent direction to Kennedy that, hopefully, she can apply from the assembly and the senate, so I'm not sort of repetitive. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: And I do kind of have a question based on what you said because I remembered before that I was moving Oak Grove up. This was obviously a different plan, but that some of these may start having to go east, and that's why I put Folsom and Rancho Murieta with this as well from last time, but is that still okay to keep pushing these east this way instead of, yeah.
COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Well, because I'm thinking with the push coming up, it's hard for me to know where that line's going to be drawn, and if it has to go east, that's okay. I'd rather try to, you know, keep that whole Lincoln, Roseville, El Dorado Hills, like that whole piece together. But if it has to go east, I think it has more commonality with that. So thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, if it needs to go east -- we've gotten public comment asking for Folsom to actually stay with El Dorado in those areas as a way of, if possible, making it less long of a district on the east side. And so I guess what they want is actually to go west, go further west and then shrink from the bottom up on that one.

But I just want to say we're getting conflicting on should Folsom stay with El Dorado or move towards Sacramento. So whatever we need is going to be okay because it'll make someone happy and not make another person happy.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm sorry. I was just going to echo Commissioner Sadhwani's comments about
ripple effect, and we just don't know where it's all going. So I mean try to be getting super specific at this point, I think we're spinning our wheels and giving our line drawers a headache. It's giving me a headache too, but that's beside the point.

But I'm sorry, I was a little bit late. Did we give specific direction, population targets for our VRA districts in the Central Valley?

CHAIR LE MONS: No. Feel free.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I guess if I'm going to throw one number against the wall, you know, I think Commissioner Andersen shared a percent, I'd like to be at least a percent at the highest, I mean, that 7,600 people, I mean, we'd end up having to move around. I mean, if we could -- I don't know if a half a percent is reasonable at this point. You know, it's the first time we've done this, so I'd like to be closer. I don't know what my colleagues are thinking about that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. I think trying to stay at 1 percent, and then we can do the tweaks in live session next week, I think would be reasonable on the VRA districts. I don't know if we can ask the line drawers, given are still are -- they -- our back and forths, I think that's -- those -- trying to get
those numbers all the over would be a little
unreasonable.

But for the VRA districts, yeah, if they could hit 1
percent, I think that would be reasonable. And I know
they're going to try understanding where they need to go
to bring the others down.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. And I'll
just state the obvious. As close to zero as possible
would be my preference. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm in agreement with
Commissioner Ahmad.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So am I, Kennedy, as close to
zero as possible. Please continue.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Thank you. All understood. So
we left off with West Placer, and so now I'm going to
actually go back to zooming out and looking at this
Eastern California. We're going to be on page 28. And
here, as before, you know, keeping Mono, Inyo, and Alpine
with the north, keeping Sierra/Nevada together, keeping
Placer/El Dorado together, keeping Mariposa, Tuolumne,
Calaveras, and Alpine together as well, and that is
reflected in this.

And again, if we zoom back into Sacramento, I know
you've seen it, but we have El Dorado Hills, Folsom, and Granite Bay all together in this as well.

CHAIR LE MONS:  Continue.

MS. WILSON:  And a part of Stanislaus -- oh, sorry.

CHAIR LE MONS:  No, no, go on.

MS. WILSON:  Okay. And then we saw this earlier as well, but just a reminder that this part of Stanislaus was taken in for population, and still at negative four.

And so now I'm going to move on to our last visualization for my area. We have page 26, should be the right number. And we're going to be looking at Northern California. And the major change here was taking out Yolo and not having that a part of it, but then again, keeping Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta, Lassen of course together. We do go into Humboldt for grabbing the Karuk Tribe to keep them together, and Butte, Sutter, and Yuba together as well.

And in this visualization, because of how the north is, Colusa does go up with the northern counties as well. And that is all.

CHAIR LE MONS:  Thank you very much. And again, Kennedy, thanks for your patience.

So we're going to move to the Bay Area. I believe Tamina is going to be presenting?

MS. RAMOS ALON:  That's correct.
CHAIR LE MONS: Awesome.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Chair, ready to go.

CHAIR LE MONS: Pardon me.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I said, yes, Chair, ready to go.

CHAIR LE MONS: Oh, awesome. Nice to see you.

We're ready for you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Nice to see you. Good afternoon, everybody. So we are going to be starting on page 9, with NORTHCOAS. Again, just to give you a little bit of an idea of the architecture of what went on in this area, the biggest change that we had in this northern area was the movement of Yolo, as Kennedy just described.

So we're going to be talking about Yolo coming down and being with Solano, and the effect that that's kind of had on the East Bay regions. But we'll start first up here on page 9, with NORTHCOAS.

The change for NORTHCOAS was removing Lake. The direction was to take Lake out of the coastal areas. I did receive direction yesterday in senate to move Lake back with the coastal areas. So I would appreciate direction on if you would like it to continue to stay this way in congress, or if you would like Lake to be moved in with the NORTHCOAS, as was requested for senate.

Taking out Lake the trade in Sonoma County was in the south. By direction I took in Petaluma, so this is
Petaluma City, which is now whole with the NORTHCOAS district, and out of the YOLOLAKE area, which brings us to page number 10, which is YOLOLAKE, this yellow area here. So if you'll recall before, this was -- had these areas coming over, and did not have Lake County in it because Lake was with NORTHCOAS. So now Lake is with Napa, as requested, and some of Solano County was taken out, the Petaluma area over here, to accommodate for that.

We're going to move to page 13, with page 12 in our back pocket, we're going to be talking about both of these two together. So this is CONCORDTR, and this starts on page 13. We have Yolo added, and more of Solano. The request was to put more of Solano into the area with Yolo, and so we have those two together now. Also, you'll recall West Sacramento was with Kennedy's areas before in this visualization. Yolo is kept whole, and West Sacramento is kept with Yolo as requested.

The population for this area had to come down and grab from East Contra Costa, which you'll see over here. This visualization starts up in Yolo and then comes down and takes Eastern and Central Contra Costa County, to the county borderlines.

And I'd like to discuss that in conjunction with NORTHCONT, which is number 12, page number 12, to show
you a little bit about how this architecture came about.
So NORTHCONT, page 12, used to go north and south.
You'll remember that last time we had some visualizations
that were stretching north-south across Contra Costa
County, and the request was to make a more Highway 4
based district that would stretch along Highway 4 over
here, through the northern part of Contra Costa County,
but they would also take Vallejo and Benicia.

So with Vallejo and Benicia being added to this
visualization, we came across Highway 4 as far as
possible for population's sake, and stopped in Pittsburg,
could add a little bit more, but it would split Antioch
over here. And then so that left the rest of Contra
Costa County that used to be in the north-south
configuration which is now joined with the CONCORDTR
coming up to Yolo.

Also very closely associated with page 11, which is
OAKLAMORI, where my direction was to keep Oakland whole.
And so here is Oakland whole in this visualization.
Again, this goes with this Delta-based area here in
CONCORDTR, the Highway 4 based area in NORTHCONT which
includes the Benicia and Vallejo communities to link them
with Martinez, and some of the working-class communities
in Contra Costa County, which also affects the next one,
which is page 14, which is SCALRATRACY.
CHAIR LE MONS: What were -- excuse me.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sorry.

CHAIR LE MONS: Before we go over there, Commissioner Fernández?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Tamina, with that. My -- gosh darn it -- with the CONCORD, page 13, if we move up. So that Contra Cos -- I'm moving my mouse like it's on your screen, which is not helpful. Yeah, like that whole Contra Costa, I would like to see what we can do to not put that in that same district with Yolo and Solano. And I would like to try to keep Solano as whole as possible.

But then, of course, it's going to impact everything, that yellow one, which is the YOLOLAKE, so I was trying -- I didn't have enough time to try to move the numbers around, but my only other kind of option also was to maybe put Marin back with the coastal and move Del Norte, which then shifts everything down.

So then that's when I started getting the headache, which I'm sure you've been having lots of headaches, Tamina. So I might have to ask my Commissioner Toledo if he has some suggestions on this one as well as how to move some of that around.

And it's similar, Tamina, to what I -- the comments that I made for senate. But thank you very much, this
definitely looks a lot better, and I really appreciate all the efforts, you and Kennedy and Jaime, and -- I can't remember the new gal's name --

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sivan.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: -- Sivan -- have done.

Thank you so much.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And, yes, I'm happy to -- I remember the Del Norte conversation, moving that over, so I will be taking a look at that for sure. And just before everybody gets upset about this one, I want to tell you a little bit about SCALRATRACY, just because it all fits together. And then I'd like you to please comment about what you would like to do about this area. But SCALRA --

CHAIR LE MONS: Before you go there, Tamina, let me just check in. I see some hands. So I want to make sure that I give commissioners a chance to chime in.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I do have a comment, but I'm happy, if Tamina wants to finish that conversation about the SCALRATRACY one, that makes sense to me because my comments will actually include a portion of that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Awesome.

Commissioner Toledo? You're on mute.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay. Sorry about that.
I was going to touch on the Marin/Sonoma/Napa map that Commissioner Fernandez just spoke about --

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- if that's okay. So I would agree with Commissioner Fernandez about adding Marin back to the northern NORTHCOAS map. I think that is a coastal -- in terms of anchor, it's the coast. And then take in the wine country portions of Sonoma, which would be the City of Sonoma, Kenwood, places where the farmworkers live like Roseland, Rohnert Park area. And that should have -- that area around there should have about the same number of population. Some of the Santa Rosa area will have to come in, which is the unincorporated areas of Roseland, should make up for the population of Marin. So it's taking in -- going into Santa Rosa somewhat to offset the Marin piece. Marin doesn't have as much of a connection to the wine, Napa and lake.

And in terms of Tamina's question about Lake County, I would leave Lake County with Napa in this version, in the congressional version. And I potentially would leave Del Norte in this close -- in this map as well, if we can, to make it a coastal, to have the congressional representatives and have an agricultural district. And hopefully, that'll help some of the issues and some of the pressures in Yolo/Solano area as well. Thank you.
CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I was going to say --

suggest exactly the same thing about moving Marin into
the NORTHCOAS and splitting Sonoma.

Tamina, I think you went through the NORCAL one,
the big block on the eastern side. I know that this
particular visualization is almost four and a half
percent over the deviation. So one thought I have to
bring it down a little bit because the eastern -- East
California, the ECA visualization is a little low, my
thought was, and Commissioner Fernandez may be able to
speak to this a little bit more better, but I was
thinking perhaps we could take a portion of Plumas County
and add it to that ECA visualization to bring the
deviations more closer to zero percent for both NORCAL --
NORCA and ECA, I guess.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Tamina?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes. And thank you. I am
receiving -- I am furiously scribbling. So I am nodding
and I'm happy to work with Kennedy on working on those
areas. But thank you for those suggestions.

CHAIR LE MONS: Please continue.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Just the one thing that I want to
say about SCALRATRACY before we open this whole area back up for discussion is that the SCALRATRACY, this visualization in yellow that you're seeing, which is on page 14, keeps together -- this is the Tri-Valley up to San Ramon request that was put in here. And so that's -- this is -- you have the Oakland whole, Tri-Valley up to San Ramon, Delta, and then the Highway 4, which is what's creating this very interesting area of what do we do with the rest of Contra Costa County. So those are kind of the hard lines which are creating this question.

Before, you'll, we did further east in -- with Contra Costa. And so that is an option. But I am happy to hear of any ideas of ways that this visualization could be improved. I just wanted -- I know that this tri-county area was important in this particular visualization, and I wanted to point that out to commissioners before they continued.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, you know, I'm not prepared to answer the question that Tamina just raised, though if I look at my notes, I might have some response. In general, what I -- what my comment was going to be is first, thank you because I see a lot of our testimony -- or excuse me, our direction reflected here, right, I see that the architecture has changed significantly from last
week given all of the direction that we requested.

And I'm trying to think big picture. We are moving towards opening Sunday with -- or next week with line drawing, live line drawing. And I think this is a process question for the commission. If there are major architectural shifts that folks want to see such as put Marin back with the coast, I think now is absolutely the time to give those. And I support Marin back with the coast. I agree with that.

But beyond that, I think there's a lot of areas in here, Sacramento, Yolo, Solano, the Tri-Valley, where we have struggled to figure out the right combination. And what I wanted to suggest is providing a little bit more discretion in our direction to Tamina to, in advance of moving towards a draft map that we're going to hopefully vote on and approve on November 10th, which is early next week, that we start really focusing instead on balancing these populations so that what -- next week when we're looking at a map, -- we're a lot closer, we'll have the VRA pieces locked in, we're going to have that ripple effect, and then we can see what we're really working with.

I think Tamina has a really great handle on the direction that we've given her. I think that's evident here. Are there areas of concern? Sure, there are. But
I think once we get our deviations lower for the next round, we can start, you know, thinking about like the smaller shifts that may or may not be possible towards a draft, right, like this isn't even our final. So that's kind of the process that I'm thinking about.

And, for example, like I'm looking at that OAKLAMORI piece -- district in green there, which is already within in that one percent deviation that we had asked for. To me, looks pretty good, right? What can we do in the other areas where that ripple effect is going to continue on? I would be very open to seeing what Tamina can come back with given all of these conversations that we've had for many weeks now towards our draft next week. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just come back to me.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I like that direction from Commissioner Sadhwani.

If you can zoom out a little bit please. Yeah, it's a little funky kind of coming out here. You know, you did take our direction and you did what we asked for, but it is a little funky.

I do support the Marin to the coast again. What
I -- I just in a general direction I'd kind of like to see if we could kind of rotate this yellow/blue/purple thing around a little bit to maybe put as much of Solano in with Yolo and then bring -- you know, make the purple go down or split the purple up to go -- some north and some south, I guess, is what I'm kind of thinking may -- would make a little more sense. So -- but I'll leave it to your discretion.

But I do want to make an observation here. I mean, if you look what we've done, there's essentially no overlap between Tamina and Kennedy, right. We made this thing go north-south with a pretty hard line in the middle. And I think that for our direction, you know, that's tying hands here. I don't have an answer to that, although, you know, so I just want to share that observation. I don't know if others have some ideas about how we can go east to west to sort of break this loose a little bit.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

You know, going back to what Tamina had said earlier, the conundrum of what to do with Central Costa -- Contra Costa in this scenario is perplexing to say the least. I mean, I see the rationale for a Delta based or Delta and agriculture based district to the east
and north of that, you know, perhaps going over into some Delta areas in San Joaquin County, certainly the tails of Sacramento County, part of Solano, Yolo County, et cetera. But it does leave us with Central Contra Costa.

I guess, on Marin I'm thinking more -- I think it was Commissioner Toledo a month ago or so, someone mentioned that, you know, there are -- there's a discrete part of Marin that is very much coast-looking, coast-focused. And there is also a part that is more bay-focused. And I would not mind seeing a split there.

I don't know what it would do if we moved Vallejo from NORTHCONT and tried to do something that made a little more sense as far as Central Contra Costa. But that's where I am on some of these questions. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: You -- excuse me. Thank you,
Commissioner.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.
Commissioner Kennedy, I support splitting Marin.
We've heard that it's two different types of industry there, going with the coast and then those that are a little bit more inland. And with that split, it would perhaps allow -- again, we keep speaking in terms of ripple. I like the configuration actually. And I think in live line drawing, a lot of the corrections -- we can
make some of those adjustments there. And the only thing
I would perhaps be -- no, actually I'm going to stop
there. I think we can correct it in live line drawing.
I like the configuration. And I think some of it can be
handled by splitting Marin coastal from that other part
that's more inland.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to also recognize that Tamina, you did
a great job in listening to what we had to say and that
as much as we can, you know, kind of keep the working
class in that north county, the NORTHCONT one -- and I
know we're a little over, but just -- and also thinking
about, you know, the working class again and Oakland --
and the Oakland one, I think we're going really well.

There is that central -- I mean, the CONCORD one.
That one is a tough -- and there are little tweaks that
can be done to kind of make the CONCORD more of the
professional suburban versus working class. I mean,
there's some like Antioch and others that could still
move -- be moved into the north, but that's already over.
And move more -- to me, it makes more sense to follow
the -- there's two rivers there -- follow one of the
rivers into the kind of San Joaquin because when we --
you do -- you know, going back to what -- you know, we do
need to go -- this line is really causing some challenges
when you look at the numbers, the negatives and the
positives. And if we're -- if we are going to get into
more positives, we are going to have to cross some of
these pretend lines that we created for the line drawers.

So I would like to let the line drawers, you know,
know that we understand that we need to let go of some
our restrictions that we've given you so that we can get
to equal numbers as well as, you know, contiguous, we've
been good at contiguous, you know, and compact is kind of
further down.

But we understand that we will need to cross some of
those lines to get to equal numbers. So please don't
feel like your hands are as tied as we have tied them in
the past.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, thank you.

And thank you for that, Commissioner Sinay.

And if we go east into San Joaquin, because we do
recognize the congressional we're going to have to go
into some of these counties and splits, I would hope
looking at what's currently there, the Isleton, Walnut
Grove, all of that, that we'd be looking at some of those
smaller unincorporated areas that would get us closer
like perhaps Terminus. I don't think there's much
there. But maybe even kind of a scoop into Woodbridge,
Coulterville, you know, somewhere through there. We know
we couldn't go all the way through and cut it off.

Well, we actually talked about moving Elk Grove and
what have you. So maybe at the top end of the San
Joaquin to pull some of the numbers might work, Tamina.
If you go there, I would just want to ensure that those
cities would be those that are matched with the Rio
Vista, Isleton, all of those places on both sides of the
river -- the water there. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Tamina, you can continue.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you, Chair.

And just a quick reminder of some of the things that
we've done before because I don't want anybody to think
that Kennedy and I have any hard lines between our areas.
We've been swapping back and forth quite a lot. You will
recall the Elk Grove being with Yolo and Solano, which
then we were given direction -- I already see people
making faces. Yeah, we were given direction to reverse
that switch. There's been Yolo in and out of both
sections, West Sac definitely in and out of both
sections. We also had down here Contra Costa extending
both to the Lincoln, Stockton border and actually taking
part of Stockton in previous visualizations. And we had
the Alameda County area take Mountain House and Tracy,
and previously it actually came all the way out to
Lathrop and Manteca.

So these new lines are actually -- are actually
pretty new. These hard lines on the counties over here
and in the areas are reflective of just last week's
direction to do this. So happy to explore again into the
eastern areas. Happy to also -- if you'd like me to find
previous visualizations that had these areas together,
happy to find those as well.

Oh, we also had the Santa Clara into Stanislaus
visualization before as well, which we were asked to not
do again. So that being said, thank you very much. I
will take direction to have a look at this East Bay area.
And we will move into greater Eden --

CHAIR LE MONS: Befo --

MS. RAMOS ALON: -- which is on page -- I'm sorry.

CHAIR LE MONS: Tamina, I believe Commissioner

Turner has a comment.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Tamina, thank you for
that. And I appreciate the way you and Kennedy both work
together for that to accommodate the requests. I want to
be clear that I'm -- I am not requesting, as we move
east, that you look at any configuration that would move
Mountain House and Tracy back into that area. Okay?

Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's okay. I realized that Tamina hasn't gone through the part that I want to comment on. I'll wait. Thanks.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Tamina, please move forward.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you.

So we are moving to page 15. This is Greater Eden. We have -- do have a split here in Fremont. And this is split along several COIs that have been submitted. It is split for population. But it is split along the lines of several COIs that had been submitted, the Asian-Indian community tech COI and the Asian majority tech district COIs, both have splits which follow this particular line in Fremont.

This area also has the North Berryessa COI, which is this area right here, which is kept together, which then forms this line in the south. It again has a -- in Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and Santa Clara COI kept together as well.

Moving to page 16, this is Cupertino. This is very similar to what we saw last week. There was no direction to change this area. The only change that was made is
this line up here in the North Berryessa area, which was for population between the two and to keep this COI, North Berryessa COI, together.

We'll move to page 19, which is NORTHSANM, which no longer has anything to do with NORTHSANM because this is a San Francisco-based visualization now. And I will turn on the San Francisco layers. So NORTHSANM has all of San Francisco with the exceptions of Parkside, Lakeshore, Ocean View, and this split in West Twin Peaks. This is unchanged from the previous week that you've seen this before. This is the exact same split between NORTHSANM and GREATERSA that we saw last time.

GREATERSA is on page 18. And I'd like to talk about it in conjunction with page 17, which is SANTACLAR over here because these two very much affected each other when we were drawing. So GREATERSA, which comes down through San Mateo County and to the northern part of Santa Cruz County, used to not have Los Gatos in it. So this section over here, Santa Clara County, used to not be included with GREATERSA.

Then the direction was to keep the Highway 17 corridor together and include Santa Cruz with Los Gatos, which pulled in this area into this visualization. And so what happened on the other end is that traded out, at the top part, the border between GREATERSA and SANTACLAR,
San Carlos. So there are no city splits here. This just traded out the City of San Carlos and also traded out the City of Emerald Lake Hills, which is right down here. And that's what moved this line in SANTA CLAR and GREATER SA.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Chair. Tamina, I just -- first off, I do want to express my thanks to the line drawers as well too for all the stuff that you've been doing. And I think we're getting closer. And that's why some of these comments are happening. I wanted to just start up at the very top with San Francisco. And I think that's the NORTHSANM I think, page number 19. So first off, that standard deviation is 4.32 percent. So we already know that we got too many people there. It looks like we're going to need to remove some more population from this visualization and then move it south at least for right now the way -- using it where we are right now.

I'm not sure which portion should move south. I think I'd have to go back and visit -- revisit the COI testimony. But I wanted to point that out. But in moving it south, obviously it's going to then have implications for the GREATER SA one.
And that's where a comment that I do want to make on that one, and I want to perhaps see again where maybe, Tamina, you can help or whether any of the other commissioners have some comments about it, I also perhaps -- I don't know if this is feasible or if this is heresy, I'm thinking about instead of going north-south on this, going east-west because I don't like in this particular visualization that you have some of the working-class communities like South San Francisco, Brisbane, also Daly City in with a district that is pretty affluent coastal communities.

So just to look at it a little bit differently, I might -- I just wrote a note, you know, can we just go across the bay, you know, to the other side, maybe combining it with some portion of, going up a little higher, you know, yeah, Hayward or part of Alameda, I don't know. Some of the other commissioners I'm sure will have a comment on that.

That then has ripple effects then as you go down into Santa Clara and into the remainder -- the coastal remainder part of GREATERSA, which also includes Santa Cruz. The COI testimony that we saw was that Santa Cruz also prefers or feels that they are more aligned with Monterey, not with the -- you know, the bay area peninsula of communities. So I just want to just give
general direction on that.

The last part I want to also comment on in terms of the implications of a more southward move down, it may help, I do want to just note that Gilroy being in this current Cupertino district, maybe even going up to Saint Mar -- San Martin again doesn't feel right. You have a predominately more rural farm-working kind of communities that seem like they should be put together more with the, you know, that mid-coast.

This is also where the discussions that we've been having around the VRA -- both VRA, but the kind of the districts in the Central Valley areas where there's some underpopulation around the standard deviation. This move down may help balance out some of that population deviation and bring more of communities of interest together that center around the farming, the farmworkers, and other working-class communities as well too. So I just want to stop there. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. That was lot of -- it sounds like a lot of fairly significant architectural changes. So I just wanted to reup what I've said previously.

I think we've got these anchor areas that we're working on. There's going to be ripple effects
everywhere. And I think as we strive towards a draft map on November 10th, I'm going to continue to reiterate that date because I think it's coming up. And I think we have to get comfortable with the fact that we might not have it perfectly correct by then.

I think we need to begin to focus some of our efforts here on the deviations. I raised my hand because I wanted to ask Tamina about the San Francisco region. Last week I had raised -- and I think I've raised it also in the assembly and probably the senate too -- in that upper part of San Francisco, we've had differing testimony from various communities of interest. We've had testimony from historic and cultural AAPI and immigrant groups with very specialized needs in terms of language access and services, including Chinatown. At the same time -- and I know that you've heard that testimony because I see West Twin Peaks is now a part of San Francisco.

We've had testimony from the LGBTQ community about where their communities lie. And so this definitely looks different from last week. But I wanted to find out if you were able to kind of play around with the Chinatown piece and seeing if it's able to connect that into the Daly City, the GREATERSA district, what our options may or may not have been, and then also thinking
about the West Twin Peaks neighborhood.

And, of course, I'm recognizing that both of these districts are overpopulated at this point in time. So I'd be curious to hear from you, knowing that our -- you know, the interest is to keep those two communities of interest intact to the greatest extent possible, what are our options for doing so while at the same time reducing this deviation? And I'm sorry if I'm putting you on the spot.

MS. RAMOS ALON: So, first, I want to say this is the same visualization from the last week. The changes --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh.

MS. RAMOS ALON: -- that were made were actually on the senate one. The senate and assembly ones, we have different splits in all of them, not -- sorry -- senate, assembly. The senate has it all together. So we -- there's a line in assembly which we took out certain neighborhoods and put in other neighborhoods. And then this one we didn't change because the majority of it was in San Francisco proper.

In terms of moving Chinatown, which is up here, down with San Mateo County, let's see, I suppose you could, because this is such a larger split, it's less of a 50-50 split that we see more in the assembly, you could make
maybe just if you were to just take up the coast here
some areas, split a couple neighborhoods on the coast to
get to Chinatown. And that would be -- that would
replace this area here to go up and to get Chinatown
there. That's pretty much the only option for linking
Chinatown since there is only a small population that
needs to be taken out. We're happy to hear any other
suggestions. I can definitely look at it some more.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And how about -- I think
that the thought from some of the groups that we've heard
from is linking the opposite side through Outer Sunset,
Golden Gate Park, and up that way. But I guess I'm
curious if -- what are our options here in terms of the
deviation, like so as we move towards a draft map and we
need to get these deviations down, you know these -- this
map very well at this point, what do you see as some
options for us? What would we need to lose, for example,
in this NORTHSANM, I think that's how you say it,
district in order to get that deviation down? Where
would -- where are places that we could cut from if we're
going to maintain, for example, the LGBTQ community of
interest? I guess those are the kinds of trade-offs that
I'm trying to really understand as we move into this
next phase.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And we're actually --
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee?

I'm sorry. Go ahead, Tamina.

MS. RAMOS ALON: They're act -- I'm sorry.

CHAIR LE MONS: Go on, I'm sorry.

MS. RAMOS ALON: There are actually --

CHAIR LE MONS: Go ahead, Tamina.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sorry.

There are actually quite a few communities of interest in San Francisco that we're keeping an eye on. And so that's the difficult part is really balancing those all out. Because the popu -- so there is always the option of going over the Golden Gate Bridge if we wanted to do -- okay. I'm seeing furious shakings of heads. Okay. No problem.

But that would've been another way to split up San Francisco. If we are not going to go across the Golden Gate Bridge, then really this area has nothing -- the northern area has nothing to connect to, and it has to connect to the rest of San Francisco. And so the question really is just where that line is going to be. To deal with the deviation, which is a little bit overpopulated, we can look at moving the line a little bit to -- into these other areas. It's not going to be a lot. It would not be enough to really take in a whole 'nother neighborhood, for example, just because these
areas are so densely populated. But I'm happy to look at any suggestions of maybe areas that you looked into or if you wanted me to just redraw this and take a look at coming up this way, coming up the western area, then we could do that, or just trying to get as close as I can to zero by taking out -- maybe I could try taking out some of the eastern areas instead of the west to get that down to zero. And then hopefully that will create GREATERSA up to Chinatown. But I'm happy to look at that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair.

So continuing this line of thought, you know, whatever you do with San Francisco, Tamina, I think obviously we're going to need to push the population down, right, down the peninsula --

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- and eventually getting into the Central Valley where we have some negative deviations that we need to fill in. So whatever you do with San Francisco, working down here -- let's see, let's get down to Santa Cruz. Let's see. I would -- I understand Commissioner Akutagawa's creative thought to cross the bay possibly. I would be against that. The bay is a uncrossable barrier mentally in my mind as a lifelong,
three-generation East Bay resident, completely different than West Bay, East Bay.

So getting into Santa Cruz then, yeah, getting quite a bit of testimony wanting to keep all the Monterey Bay communities together. So if Santa Cruz itself gets moved down into the mid-coast, I would not feel strongly about keeping the Highway 17 communities together with Los Gatos. That's -- I mean, that is a commuter corridor for sure. But the communities are not really joined. So could move that line.

And then let's see. Yeah, just looking at Santa Cruz, keeping it with Monterey Bay all together then and then pushing population to the south and east. So that's all. Thanks.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. Thank you.

Can we go back up to -- well, first, let me -- let's stay here. And I completely agree with Commissioner Russell -- Commissioner Yee, you know, we kind of said the 17 corridor, if we needed it, it wasn't something that we were very adamant about. And I still feel uncomfortable, in all of these, that we have cut Santa Cruz so many times because it isn't that big of a community. And so I -- it's looking like we -- you know,
it might be better not to need it so that we can move
things north and east, I mean south and east. I knew I
was going to get one of them wrong.

If we could go back up to San Francisco. And I
think it -- San Francisco is one of the most unique
places in the world I -- you know, having lived there,
having worked in the community there, and having worked
in other places. But San Francisco is very small, very
dense. I mean, you know, I think you could compare San
Francisco in some of the challenge -- luckily, we're not
doing New York City in redistricting.

But I think we need to keep -- there's a -- every
neighborhood is unique on its own way. They all have a
lot of history and sometimes things have changed since
its historic -- its history, but it's still considered
that -- you know, defined that -- those neighborhoods are
defined that way.

And we have mentioned two neighborhoods, basically
the LGBTQ and the Asian community, but there is also a
Latino and black community. And they used to be very
separate, one from the other. I was happy -- you know,
happy to see in the COI testimonies we received that the
Latino and the black communities are working closer
together.

It was I who said, you know, it made sense to move
Excelsior, Bayview, and Visitacion Valley, in I think it was either the senate or assembly, over to Daly City because I thought -- and I -- and you know, I don't know that it -- that the Asian and other -- you know, that they're all working class, lower-income communities. And that was without the Mission and Potrero Hill and other areas that are traditionally more Latino and also working class.

What's really difficult is that San Francisco's very dense. And we're going to make people unhappy. And so I think as we're looking at how we do this, you know, we keep saying it's going south; there is an easier solution. And I'm just going to put it out there just because I don't want people to think we haven't thought of this. And I'm not advocating it.

But there -- as much as West Marin and the whole Bay Area says they're very different than San Francisco, they do commute back and forth, not -- over the bridge, through the ferries. Any time you sit in the ferry -- at the ferry building, you'll see all -- a lot of the commuters. There are a lot of similarities. But I understand, you know, the idea of not crossing the bridge.

But if it -- if crossing the bridge helps us with the negative -- you know, get to those numbers that we
need for a congressional district, then I think we need
to be okay with that. I do understand crossing the bay
the other way to the east. It's -- it is mentally -- you
know, it's not just that it's mentally different, they
are very -- they are working-class communities, but
they're very different types of working-class communities
and the types of jobs that they have and the types of
unions they belong to and how they're organized and their
religions and such. And so that is -- it is harder to
match them that way.

But I just want to say with San Francisco, that it
isn't just LGBT, white, and Asian and -- but that it is a
very diverse community in so many different ways because
even Latinos aren't just all from Mexico. There's a lot
of Central American as well. And the Asian are all one.

And so we're going to make people happy or not happy
in this area as well. And when we -- when people are
happy and not happy, it means we're doing our job because
we've struggled with it. So my -- as much as we can keep
some of those communities together, that's great, but we
really do need to get these numbers closer to zero.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Yee, did you have another comment?

COMMISSIONER YEE: No. Sorry.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, thank you.
Tamina, you can continue.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We're going to page 20, which is MONTCOAST -- MIDCOAST, sorry, MONTCOAST isn't assembled. MIDCOAST is here. MIDCOAST had no direction to change in the last week.

I do hear the current direction to see if I can include Santa Cruz County whole with the MIDCOAST area. I will also be working with Kennedy to take a look at the San Benito and Monterey areas to see if we can see if any of that is going to be incorporated with more Central Valley areas for following previous direction that was given.

Page 21 is SOUTHCOAST. Again, there is no change from last week on this one. However, I will note that the islands will be moved according to new direction to be with their corresponding counties instead of all together in the Santa Barbara-based district.

And, lastly, we have VENTURA on page 22, which takes all of Ventura County except for Bell Canyon. If you'll recall, the last -- the previous visualization had Westlake and Agoura Hills, did not have Calabasas. And the direction was to include Calabasas in this visualization. And so that has been included, which dropped the deviation down to 0.43 percent. And that is the end of my areas.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you.

Tamina, thanks for this. I want to just continue
some of the -- for me, what I see as the ripple effects
as we're pushing south. For this MIDCOAST, pushing it
down south into -- beyond San Luis Obispo and into the
northern Santa Barbara County, I feel like, you know, San
Luis Obispo kind of is the, I guess, is kind of the
anchor point here between the coastal communities. COI
testimony speaks to a desire to be affiliated, the
northern Santa Barbara County, portion of the county, to
be affiliated with SLO and then for SLO to be then
affiliated with Monterey County.

So I -- my -- I just want to just give direction in
saying that if you have to push down into souther --
north Santa Barbara County using Buellton, Los Olivos,
that Gaviota Tunnel -- and I think we spoke about this
before -- as your dividing line so that you have some
flexibility there as well too, that would honor, I think,
some COI testimony we received.

And then in terms of going into VENTURA, one thought
I have is perhaps -- I know we've received a lot of
testimony from folks. Honestly, I think this gets to,
you know, what some of the commissioners have said about,
you know, at some point, we're just not -- we're just
going to have make decisions. Some places may not go
with others. And some people are not going to be happy.

On that thought, perhaps splitting MALIBU, as you
have to push down south, split MALIBU maybe right before
the City of Malibu if that gives you enough population
to capture for, you know, this next -- for this -- you
know, as the ripple effects go south. So I just wanted
to give that direction to hopefully give you some
flexibility. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I apologize. I want
to go back up to the north real quick just to clarify my
direction. I went back and in taking a look at some of
that testimony, the COI testimony that we've received
both from AAPI, AMEMSA, as well as Equality California --
and I think what I'm looking at could help us solve some
things.

I misspoke. The piece around Chinatown I think was
for the assembly districts. And on the congressional
side, I do think if -- you know, if we cut, right, we're
overpopulation right now, so if we go back and include
that West Twin Peaks and start cutting from some of the
pieces on the lower end, some of those neighborhoods on
the lower end to get closer down to that zero deviation.
And their report has all sorts of stuff on there if you
take a look at Equality California, their page 14, and AAPI and AMEMSA has it on page 7, actually fairly similar and that includes Chinatown and Japantown.

I understand Commissioner Sinay's piece around other communities. Certainly, there's been a lot of testimony about housing affordability and tenant protections, food security, healthcare services. So I'm definitely sensitive to all of that.

My sense is actually if we can get this piece down to that correct deviation and then we have this -- the VRA stuff in the Central Valley, including Merced and San Benito, rippling upward, it's going to help us figure out, and those become two kind of anchor points throughout this region, it's going to help us figure out a lot more of those questions around Santa Cruz where I hear commissioners having somewhat different directions there.

So that would be my more specific direction. So I apologize. I just wanted to go back and clarify that because I think I had it wrong the first time.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I -- as you zoomed in, I noticed a little tip of Alameda's still there. Is that somehow connected to San Francisco in its --
apparently, it is. It just seems odd.

COMMISSIONER YEE: It is. It's an anomaly.

MS. RAMOS ALON: These are all San Francisco census blocks.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I assume the --

MS. RAMOS ALON: It is actually -- yes, this is actually not part of Alameda, this little area over here.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, it's not.

MS. RAMOS ALON: It's very odd. Let me show you the --

COMMISSIONER YEE: It's unpopulated.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I don't know why they draw it that way, but it is actually part technically of San Francisco. But it is -- yeah, it is unpopulated.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So we are going across the bay, Russell -- Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: It's because of the landfill, yeah. Well, it's all landfill.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani, did you have another comment? Okay.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I just wanted to explain that was landfill added to Alameda in the mid-20th century. It did end up crossing the city line.

CHAIR LE MONS: Got you.
Commissioner Akutagawa?

Okay. Tamina, you can continue.

MS. MACDONALD: So we're ready to move on to the Los Angeles area if you would like to do that, Chair Le Mons.

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes, please.

MS. MACDONALD: Okay. Just one moment. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: While I'm setting up --

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- my --

CHAIR LE MONS: I'm sorry, Jaime.

While you're setting up that up, Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have another comment?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I -- just one last thing. I just wanted to mention to Tamina, I also noticed I believe we're splitting a COI on that VENTURA/SOUTHCOAS visualization. It looks like San Buenaventura is separated from Fillmore and Piru. And it is a very distinct COI that we got quite a bit of testimony about that. So I just wanted to note that if it does push south, it'll alleviate that split. But I wanted to point that out. That is a concern. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

Jaime, I'm sorry.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much.

I'm getting my map set up. And just so everyone
knows and can prepare, we're going to start on page 49.
So if you wish to go to page 49 of the handout, I will
join you there very shortly. One moment please.

CHAIR LE MONS: Let me do a point of check-in here.
We're going to be breaking for lunch in about nine
minutes. So just keep that in mind, everyone. I could
even break now, and we could have a little longer lunch,
which I'd be -- yeah, okay.

So, Jaime, why don't we do that, why don't we go to
lunch? We'll come back and start with Los Angeles right
after lunch.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: So let me see here. Give me one
second.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thanks, Chair. That's very
generous of you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So 1:30. We're going to
break for lunch, Kristian, now and come back at 1 -- wait
a minute. I have a little discrepancy in my flow here.
So we're supposed to be back at 1:30. Is that what
you're showing as well?

MR. MANOFF: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Then we'll be back at 1:30.
Everyone -- that doesn't get -- yes, okay. 1:30 back.
That'd give you a little bit longer for your lunch.
Enjoy it. And then we'll start with Los Angeles with Jaime upon return. Thanks, everyone.

(Off the record at 12:37 p.m.)

(On the record at 1:30 p.m.)

MR. MANOFF: Welcome back, Chair.

CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back, everyone. I hope you had a nice relaxing lunch. We're going to jump right in and pick up where we left off. We were about to move into Los Angeles visualizations. So at this time, I'm going to turn the floor over to Jaime.

Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much, Chair Le Mons.

And good afternoon, Commissioners. We are going to start on page 49 of the congressional visualization handout. And just like the other areas, we are going to begin with visualizations Mr. Becker might want to chime in on.

So this visualization, LBNORTH, it incorporates the direction that was provided by commissioners to have Long Beach area moving north along 710 corridor and to include those in -- to include those areas in a district with Long Beach. A change is that Long Beach is split.

That change occurred as a result -- and we'll -- we can get into this more later -- of moving sort of the Compton area with Inglewood, which underpopulated this
visualization and needed to pick up visualization -- or
needed to pick up population. So that's just balancing
population. This is a 2.98 percent deviation.

MR. BECKER: Anyhow --

CHAIR LE MONS: (Indiscernible) --

MR. BECKER: -- I'll just chime in really quickly
because this might go quickly.

CHAIR LE MONS: Go ahead, Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: Looking at this screen --

CHAIR LE MONS: (Indiscernible) --

MR. BECKER: -- yeah, looking at this screen, I
don't think there's a lot I have to say. Just obviously,
as I've been a broken record on this, pay particularly
close attention to the deviations as to whether it's a
district that you're likely to need to subtract some
population from or add some population from. But this is
an area of Voting Rights Act where the Voting Rights Act
is quite relevant. And it's -- and it appears that those
contents have been taken into account.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I just
wanted to repeat what I had said yesterday at the wrong
time, I guess. I would like to see this redrawn to keep
most of Long Beach whole. It will need to add kind of a
bridge to re -- or the district to the west, the 710
district, would need a beachhead in northern Long Beach to reach up to the rest of its population. And we would need to look at taking population from the north end of this district to compensate and moving it to the 710 district in order to compensate for the population that's put back with the rest of Long Beach. So --

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, I apologize. It froze a little bit for me. I don't know if it froze for everyone. No? So everyone got to hear fully what Mr. Ke -- what Commissioner Kennedy said? Okay, awesome. Okay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. And, Jaime, the portion of northern Long Beach that I'm talking about using as a bridge to get up to the rest of the 710 population is preferably exactly the same portion of northern Long Beach that is not part of the main Long Beach district at the assembly level. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

I just -- I know we have -- this is the very first one, so sorry about that, Jamie.

And this is probably more for you, David Becker. The visualization right next to it to the left, which also has a CVAP of 51.63, that is not a VRA
consideration, correct?

MR. BECKER: The areas in South L.A. around the
district that's South L.A., STHLA and SP710, those are
areas where we did not see consistently the third Gingles
precondition. But they are areas of significant minority
concentrations. And it's probably unlikely that -- it's
probably very likely that those districts will see
significant percentages like the type we're seeing right
here.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you for that.
And as Commissioner Kennedy mentioned, I would like to
see if it can be withdrawn or can be redrawn -- sorry,
not withdrawn -- to include as much of Long Beach as
possible, but of course still maintaining the VRA aspect
of it. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

I do have some thoughts on this. And I agree with
everybody else saying -- you know, trying as best as we
can to keep the majority of Long Beach whole if it's
possible. I know that there hasn't been presentations of
this part, but I just want to note that SHORELINE, which
is right next to the SP710, has a standard deviation of
4.68 percent. So we'll need to bring some of that down.
What I'm going to suggest is not going to bring it down a lot. But I think there will be other additional ripple effects that we'll be looking at. But I would like to suggest that we move Lomita. I believe, in some of the COI testimony that we received, Lomita feels -- there's -- that they have more of an affinity with those harbored gateway cities, which is currently the 710, the SP710 communities.

Also I'd like to suggest moving Lynwood into this visualization as well too. We've also received testimony that -- or I'm sorry. Moving Lynwood out of this visualization and into the STHLA visualization and then moving northward some portion of that STHLA -- I think it's CANNDU where you see -- it says Florence-Graham. I think that little block there -- I think that that's either Zapata King or CANNDU neighborhood council. And I think if you move that up, I think, according to just generally what I looked at in terms of population numbers, that might help offset some of the numbers that you'll be losing from -- or that you'll need to accommodate Lynwood. And then I think then maybe that might help alleviate some of the numbers in terms of, you know, creating space so that maybe all of that can be redone.

Also, I think we're going to hear some testi -- some
direction in terms of what to do with Downey and Bell Gardens and some of those gateway cities. So hopefully, some of that direction will help. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Jaime, for struggling with us with this very complicated part of the state.

I wanted to echo the call to try to keep Long Beach all together. I mean, the testimony has been so extraordinary. Somebody in Long Beach needs to write a book on community organizing. It's really been such a united call for keeping the city together as much as possible. So we'd like to do that.

I'm wondering, of course, about the VRA implications. And I'm wondering if Mr. Becker or Jaime, if you can say anything about the -- a little more granularly about the distribution of the Latino CVAP across north to south there and how it -- that would change if we do unite Long Beach itself.

CHAIR LE MONS: Go ahead, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: So this area, the gateway cities, there is a very high concentration of Latino CVAP. There is significantly lower concentrations of Latino CVAP in the Long Beach area, specifically sort of in southern Long Beach. And again, just noting that the -- in this
visualization, Long Beach was split due to the direction to keep the Compton and Inglewood areas together, which then underpopulated this visualization, SP710. It's the one that's showing up in green on your screens. And that is what caused Long Beach to be split in this visualization, LBNORTH.

CHAIR LE MONS: Mr. Becker?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Perfect. Thanks.

MR. BECKER: Yeah, I don't know if I have anything to add to that. I mean, I think that there's, look, there's a area of intensely concentrated population. There's a lot of population in this area.

And the ripple effects are going to be intensely felt no matter what there. And that could result in some packing as well that we would -- that we should probably be concerned about. So you know, at first glance, it looks like these districts do actually a fairly good job of keeping several COIs together and accommodating the Voting Rights Act concerns and are -- some need a lot more -- some need more adjustment than others with regard to deviations.

That's going to be where some of these hard choices are made. I think one of the biggest things to think about right now is how do you depopulate the slightly overpopulated ones? How do you uppopulate the ones
that need additional population here since we need to get close to zero?

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I'm certainly sympathetic to the voices of the Long Beach community. And I'm also sympathetic to the COIs in the Compton, Inglewood, and Culver City area, Watts as well. And so it seems like there's this -- and I think the other -- the third aspect is this Orange County line here too that we're trying not to go into -- we've been trying not to go into Orange County. And that's kind of limiting our options here if we want to unify Long Beach and also protect the COIs in the Compton and Inglewood area.

So we may want to give some flexibility around the Orange County line if we are interested in -- I think. And maybe it's a question for the line drawers. Would that help in -- would having some flexibility with Orange County help in potentially unifying Long Beach and protecting the VRA interests up here? Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Would you like for me to respond, Chair Le Mons?

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes. Yes, please.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

Thank you so much, Commissioner Toledo.
Last week I received direction to remove Los Alamitos and Rossmoor from this visualization. And additionally, I just would add that those communities have less Latino CVAP than some of the other areas that we're looking at here. And so I'll certainly look at potentially moving them in and whether or not that would work for this particular visualization, I think -- and part could depend on additional direction I might receive down the line when we're looking at other visualizations.

And thank you so much. I appreciate that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you, Jaime.

I know that it's like a Jenga game, right. I mean, we're taking out pieces, putting in pieces. I -- you know, this process is such that we're giving directions at -- to see what it's going to look like. And then we realize okay, it didn't really quite work like what we thought it was going to work.

I realize that both in terms of the SP710 and this LBNORTH and the STHLA and the SHORELINE, they are all pretty interconnected together. I know we've also received quite a bit of COI testimony about Gardena, and in particular that Gardena could be split. I think it was the --
MS. CLARK: Gardena is split in this visualization.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I see. Okay. So it's split at the location. I thought that was the entirety of Gardena in the SHORELINE. So that is split at the COI input request?

MS. CLARK: Yes, it's split at Rosecrans, which is north of Marine. That's generally the area that we receive COI test -- we receive COI testimony that there's a COI south of Marine, that -- and the line is just north of Marine --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- if that makes sense. And then additionally, other COI testimony grouping the sort of very northwest corner of Gardena with Hawthorne and other areas to the north. And both of those COIs are respected in this visualization.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay. I was hoping that maybe that might be a place where we could move some additional population into the South L.A. out of the SHORELINE. I'm also going to give direction. West Rancho Dominguez, which is in -- I think it's in the South L.A. visualization right now. I was also going to give direction to move that into the SP710.

I think what -- where I'm trying to go is, you know, we've talked about north-south in certain areas. In this
particular case, I think, to the point that was made, L.A. being so packed, the north-south in this particular case, you know, it's the same struggle we're having in other places like the Central Valley. Those gateway cities and Long Beach don't necessarily mix and that they're in some ways cutting off communities that they have more of an affinity with -- in terms of like Montebello, Pico Rivera, and, you know, Santa Fe Springs, and Norwalk, and some of those areas. So I -- that's where I'm trying to go with this and to see, little by little, how we can create something that creates some balance in this particular area. Thank you, Jaime.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.
I wanted to go back to the LBNORTH. Yep, right there. And I believe it was Commissioner Toledo that talked about, perhaps, going back to -- into Orange County. We have received a lot of testimony as well about including Seal Beach with Long Beach and maybe even into the Huntington Beach area. So I'd like to have you look at combining Seal Beach with Long Beach and portions as needed of Huntington area. Thank you.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think a lot of -- some of my comments have already been said. So I agree
with -- I don't know who said it at this point -- those northern cities, Vernon, Commerce, Bell Gardens, Downey, et cetera, that's really stemming out of East L.A. I could see them all going back with the 710 if need be. But I'm seeing we're already overpopulated there. So I think there's a couple options here. Certainly, I want to respect the communities of interest that we have heard loud and clear from in Long Beach to keep Long Beach as tied together as possible.

I think we had a letter even just this morning from a group pointing out if we were to cut, how to cut in such a way that preserves much of those communities. I think that's what was lifted by Commissioner Kennedy already. So definitely want to try and preserve that.

And I very much would support and be interested in taking a look at, as we're starting to cut, having that port -- that central portion of Long Beach connecting down into Seal Beach, and as Commissioner Turner mentioned, if need be, all the way down into parts of Huntington if we have to. I know we are -- we're getting a whole lot of testimony from this region. But as much as we have attempted to maintain that at OCLA border, there are places where we're going to have to end up crossing it. And I think we're at that point where we're going to have to start feeling comfortable with that
potentially. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo, did you have another comment?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I don't. Thank you.


MS. CLARK: So moving on to page 50, please. This visualization is just sort of south of the 60 corridor. It's a negative 2.07 percent deviation. It includes Montebello, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, La Mirada, the Whittiers, including Whittier, the City of Whittier, La Habra, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, and Walnut and including the very easternmost area of the City of Industry. This again is a negative 2.07 percent deviation. It's on page 50 of the handout.

MR. BECKER: I'll just add comments about this. And the district above it, the CDCOV. Both slightly underpopulated. Both keeping in mind on the -- keep an eye on that as you move the per -- the Latino concentrations in these currently appear to quite nicely accommodate the Voting Rights Act considerations that we're seeing.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I want to -- I understand what we're trying to do here. I do want to
just say that the communities of Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, Walnut are very different from the communities of Pico Rivera, Montebello, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, in particular, including parts of Whittier as well too. And so I think we've also seen COI testimony that spoke to Downey, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, Pico Rivera wanting to also be together too.

And I think that that would also preserve, as this is a potential VRA district, it could still honor, because it's all in the yellow -- I'm just going by that. I think it could still preserve the intents of what we need to meet our -- in terms of our obligations to the VRA. Thank you. And if I need to give direction, then I would like to remove those -- that portion and see how we can relook at that portion.

MS. CLARK: -- so much. Next we're please going to look at page 52 of the handout. This visualization is called CDCOV. Again, it's page 52 of the handout.

This includes South Almonte, Almonte, North Almonte, southern parts of the City of Monrovia. And it includes Bradbury, Duarte, Azusa, Irwindale, Baldwin Park, West Puente Valley, La Puente, western areas of the City of Industry, South San Jose Hills, Covina, West Covina, San Dimas, La Verne, Citrus, Azusa, and areas in Glendora that are south of 210.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have something to add?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- well, since -- I didn't mean to, but I -- since we're here and you asked, I will.

I also want to just note that in terms of commonalities of communities, San Dimas and La Verne are different from the West Covina, Covina, Baldwin Park, La Puente area communities again, and very different from Almonte and South Almonte. Again, I would like to give direction to relook at this. I think potentially Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Walnut, Diamond Bar, if we are not going to cross over into Orange County or into San Bernardino, they may be better combined with San Dimas and La Verne versus the current mix that exists right now. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, that was actually going to be some of my point. So I would like, from this CDCOV visualization, to remove La Ver -- all of La Verne, all of San Dimas, and see -- and potentially even Charter Oak, potentially Citrus depending on populations. And I would really like to see if we could get Rosemead, Alhambra, and Monterey Park in this visualization, not San -- not San Gabriel, not South Pass, not San Marino.
That would be where I'd start. There may be more
with live line drawing. But I'd like to see where
population -- where that get -- that shift back west gets
us. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'm just a little
concerned about -- these are areas where we have a
negative deviation where we have to add people. And we
are taking out of communities and -- or we're potentially
giving direction to take out when we actually need to
add. So the -- I -- and I did hear Commissioner Vazquez
add to -- making some suggestions to -- suggestions of
places where we can eventually add folks.

But we're also suggesting to taking out population
as well. So it -- I'm hoping we'll be able to give
direction to get -- try to get to -- as close to zero
deviation as possible and to give discretion to the line
drawers to -- to do so in a way that maintains the CVAP
where it is. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Can I respond? Yes. I'm
sorry. The -- my -- in my head and I did not verbalize.
And I should have.

I'd like to see the deviation get as close to zero.
And I do think even though I'm -- my direction asks to
remove a bunch from the west, my hope is that we can add
more population -- or sorry -- remove population from the east. My hope is that we would add much more from the west side of this visualization where it's currently green. I think those communities, again particularly Alhambra, Rosemead, Monterey Park, have more in common with Almonte, South Almonte, and even up through Covina than San Dimas, La Verne, and Glendora.

CHAIR LE MONS: Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: Yeah, I'm going to channel Commissioner Toledo here for a second. The -- I just want to note that even with that instruction -- and that's a perfectly fine instruction -- the green district that we're looking at is also underpopulated. So we're talking about -- what I'd advise, as we're trying to get to the draft map finalization next week, is for these congressional districts, the first thing, because it's the first criteria on your mind when you're giving advice, is if you see a positive number, removing population, if you see a negative number, adding population. And then secondary concerns come in later with regard to those populations. So I think you'll be much happier with where we are close to the finish line if we get these much closer to zero deviation.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. I mean, that's a good flag. I mean, in my head --
CHAIR LE MONS: Commis --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry.

CHAIR LE MONS: Go ahead, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. I was just going to say I mean, all those places I asked to be removed make much more sense to be added to the green. So it -- my direction, I think, is a net shifting, hopefully, again based on populations. I just -- I don't think the lines as currently drawn group all of the COIs in this area as well as they could be.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I want to piggyback on what Commissioner Vazquez is saying. I would agree. I would also add San Gabriel to that mix. I think we could leave out San Marino and Arcadia, although there are some significant Asian COIs that I think we've gotten inputs on, but in terms of balancing the population numbers, I think Alhambra, Monterey Park, Rosemead, Temple City, and San Gabriel all share fairly similar profiles.

With that said, you know, the other option on this one is to also dip in and grab Montebello as well too from -- to this. I would also suggest removing Azusa. I know, Commissioner Vazquez, you said that Azusa shares a similar profile, but I think they -- I believe, given
that they're a foothill community also, that again, to
make room for these additional cities, it may be best to
move Azusa and possibly even, you know, portions of
Duarte and putting them into more of a foothill community
district or visualization. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I'm a little at a
loss here. I mean, what I'm hearing is massive changes
to the architecture of this map. I disagree with that.

I'm not sure what commissioners mean exactly when
they say this area doesn't go with that one. The -- as
I'm seeing it, the architecture we're looking at is very
reflective of communities of interest testimony. And if
there's other testimony that I'm unaware of, please let
me know. But you know, I see this as very reflective of
much of the testimony that we've received from a whole
host of different communities of interest talking about
working-class communities, varying socioeconomic levels.

Are there improvements to be made? Sure, maybe
marginally. But I mean, I'm really concerned about swap
this, swap that, this isn't right. Like before we get to
a draft map next week, that's going to be a whole lot of
changes throughout this entire region.

You know, that's -- the green area, San Gabriel and
upward, is reflective of AAPI COIs that we received as
well as environmental COIs that we had received. These are obviously bright yellow districts. So these are VRA districts. So when we're talking about like completely overhauling them by taking out large portions, I'm really concerned about that.

In terms of the population deviation, some general thoughts for me, you know, as we go down into the Rowland Heights area, you know, we're in a negative 2.0. Pulling down possibly into Orange County could make sense. Pulling in City of Industry possibly makes sense. I don't think City of Industry has a very large population. It's predominately industrial.

MS. CLARK: I apologize --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, yeah, no, go ahead.

MS. CLARK: -- to interrupt you. Just really quick talking about that split, it does touch Pomona here. So not splitting City of Industry would mean needing to include Walnut. And that's the reason for which Industry is split. And I apologize for interrupting you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, no, no. That's totally fine. That's really helpful. That's really helpful. I mean, I'd also be curious about -- I mean, the district right next to it that includes all of Pomona is at zero population, which is phenomenal. But one of my thoughts was also, you know, could we slice into portions
of Pomona to calibrate out the population deviations as
we continue to move forward? Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I appreciate the
concern of massive changes to the architecture. And I
don't think we've actually -- I may have missed it. I
know we've had community of interest testimony around
sort of subclusters of these cities.

But I don't know that I've heard folks from La Verne
saying that they feel, you know, really close to West
Covina as compared to, you know, this -- I very much see
of -- again, like our -- many of our other maps have
reflected a foothill-ish district. And to me, Alhambra,
Rosemead, and Monterey Park again, even San Gabriel, just
make more sense from a community affiliation point of
view than La Verne, San Dimas, Charter Oak, et cetera.

I think we've only seen that maybe in one -- that
first initial foothill visualization, in one of these
visualizations. But I don't think previously we've had
an opportunity to endorse this La Verne, San Dimas
affiliation with the rest of the San Gabriel Valley. And
that, for me, is something that just doesn't make sense
from a community of interest standpoint.

And I'm not overly concerned. I do -- especially,
La Verne. There's a portion of Bonita that I think is
probably high population Latino CVAP. But La Verne and
San Dimas, ethnically and community-wise, very different
from Alhambra, Monterey Park, and Rosemead, et cetera.
So I'm -- I feel like there's absolutely a path to
maintain our CVAP numbers for the most part and not put
us in a tricky area while keeping together the
communities of interest in this congressional
visualization.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I'm with Commissioner
Vazquez on this too. The San Gabriel Valley,
particularly San Gabriel, Alhambra, Monterey Park,
Rosemead, Temple City, has a very diverse population base
of different folks. And I think that from a community of
interest, we have seen community of interest testimony
that does speak to that more San Gabriel Valley, less so
with the northern foothill communities.

I think there is -- I also agree I think there is a
way to preserve the VRA aspects of these communities with
the communities that are being discussed. I think also
if need be, yes, move into Orange County. And I think
it's -- Pomona is, I think, still L.A. County. But also,
we got significant COI testimony about keeping Whittier
together with -- or I saw COI testimony about Whittier,
South Whittier, Sante Fe Springs, Pico Rivera,
Montebello, Downey, and Norwalk also having shared communities of interest testimony as well too.

And so I think there is ways in which this puzzle piece with this particular region is still going to honor the very implications of the district that we're seeing here in the yellow, but also still being able to incorporate in communities that share similar profiles. But I would not -- I mean, I think -- I would look again, but I don't think Almonte and La Verne share, you know, similar profiles. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Does the line drawers feel like they have the direction necessary to accomplish what has amounted to a pretty robust discussion about this particular visualization, Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Actually, thank you so much, Chair Le Mons. I do have some clarifying questions. Some of this gets back to a question I asked last week, which is fundamentally does the Commission prefer districts in San Gabriel Valley to be more east-west or to be more north-south? Additionally, the direction that I just received concerning the Downey, Bell Flower area, really very happy to explore all of this. And I think that in some ways that kind of gets back to this South L.A.-based district.

And I think that there's some -- yeah, I think that
that's also a question of priority for the Commission.
This visualization, the way that sort of this whole --
I'm going to zoom out the map for a little bit. And the
way that this whole area in Los Angeles County is -- the
architecture of it, as Karin says -- the architecture of
it is really very intertwined. And changing some of
these areas would also, you know, create more of a
visualization like we had last week with Carson and
Compton together, for example.

So I think that -- I thank the Commission for this
discussion. And I think that there's some overarching
just architecture questions that are coming up right now
that to be able to create visualizations for next week
that are responsive to your direction, there -- I think
that -- yeah, I just need some more like big-picture
answers, I guess -- or big-picture direction please.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So I'm going to ask
commissioners to keep that in mind with the direction. I
do feel like we are kind of two trains running today in
terms of we had a really important discussion about the
importance of having the direction be more big picture
right now. And some of the granular stuff can get worked
out in line drawing and at another stage. So keep that
in mind and maybe not have the direction be as granular
at this point that's going to set off a domino effect
that, you know, usurps a lot of the work that's there.
There may be an opportunity -- or I won't say maybe.
There will be an opportunity to get a little bit more
granular with some of these directions.
So I'll just invite you to try to -- we want to
cause less confusion. And we have the 10th as our
deadline as well. So we want to keep all that in mind.
And that's not to say that, you know, there's no judgment
on any of the feedback. I do think it's different types
of direction that's being given at this point.
Commissioner Vazquez?
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, thank you.
And appreciate, Jaime, you pushing on this question.
I know you've asked it before. And I appreciate your
patience with us because it's really hard to keep in mind
all of the maps of the same area, whereas you are soaked
in this area, I'm sure, way more than you want to be.
That being said, my answer to your question, I do
think, particularly for the San Gabriel Valley and the
mountains, that an east-west orientation makes more sense
just given communities of interest do follow those
freeways of the 210, the -- or three freeways really, the
210, the 10, and the 60, which run east-west. And you've
heard my feedback about how I think that can be
accomplished in that area. Thank you.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I would agree on the east-west orientation. And I want to just speak to the two freeways that I believe intersect the San Gabriel Valley that are most often traveled by individuals in these communities, the 10 freeway to the north and then the 60 freeway to the south. Those are the areas that really I think define the transportation corridors of the San Gabriel Valley.

I also want to just remind us that we also had a really good conversation around northeast L.A. and also making sure that we're getting that right. And so I think that same conversation in some ways also applies here. I do know that the VRA district that is in yellow is one that we have to really grapple with. But I just want to remind us also of that northeast L.A. section as well too. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'll just reup. I don't see significant changes to this area that need to be made beyond population deviation changes. I think where we're looking at bigger changes is that Long Beach area as we've already had that conversation, and pulling more of Long Beach together, pulling out some of those green areas -- what am I looking at? Oh, sorry. No, no, no,
no. Coming down Vernon, et cetera, back into the Harbor Gateway region so that Long Beach can maintain its whole -- to me, if we're making big architectural changes between now and Sunday, that's where I would want to see the priority being put is making -- keeping that Long Beach further intact as possible.

CHAIR LE MONS: Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: I just want to remind everyone of something I said yesterday. These are -- with regard to the senate districts, these are humongous districts. These are 760,000 people each. All parts of the district are not going to be uniform. They're not going to be monolithic. It is impossible, especially in a place as diverse and complex as Los Angeles, to not include disparate areas, areas that might have different interests with regard to communities within districts this large. And that's entirely normal. That's true of all 435 house districts in the United States.

So just keep that in mind because if -- right now, the -- you know, I'll stress again the number one issue is the deviations. That is the number one thing keeping you from getting to a point where you're closer to the finish line. And there are -- you know, if you look at the area around the bay and the coastline, those tend to be overpopulated. And the areas inland that we're
looking at right now tend to -- have tended to be a little bit underpopulated.

So there are some ripple effects that are going to have to take place there to get these close to zero percent. And I can just tell you this is -- I'm going to keep being a broken record on this. Getting to close to zero percent deviation is extremely hard. And you want to get as close there as you can because at the time you're starting to make the hard decisions and moving certain blocks in and out, that gets really difficult.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I want to ask a question, Mr. Becker. So on this STH60 visualization that includes Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, and I believe Walnut, we've gotten quite a bit of testimony from the Asian AAPI community as that being an Asian COI. I'm curious because it is in a VRA district, it -- I guess I -- hearing what you're saying, I guess I'm just trying to balance out like how that might work towards the VRA. But I'll just stop there.

MR. BECKER: Well, I'll remind you there are no areas of California where the Asian community is large enough and geographically compact enough to form a majority of a congressional district, which are very,
very large. So the first Gingles precondition is not met with regard to the Asian community on the congressional maps. So there are certainly communities of interest that should be considered and kept together. They will likely be included with other communities of interest that might be slightly different. That's going to be normal in districts of this size.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, thank you.

I just really -- I feel like I can't emphasize enough that I -- while I understand and hear and respect that we're going to have to sort of create large districts that are contained within them contradictions and disparities, and I -- for me -- you know, in some ways, I guess I -- maybe I can be a bit more full-disclosure, like I feel a really strong affinity to the San Gabriel Valley. I went to school in La Verne. And I spent two years working for the school board association without an office. My office was my car.

And I represented all of the San Gabriel Valley, the mountains, and even up through La Canada Flintridge, those school districts. So I was at their school board meetings. I listened to their kids. I had lunches and coffees with those school board members from all over this region. And so I feel like I have just a lot of
knowledge and respect for all of these communities within sort of the area that we're looking at. And for me, it just -- it feels -- I don't know that the communities of Monterey Park, Rosemead, Alhambra, again even San Gabriel, maybe Temple City have the same interests. And in fact that I would say they have pretty varied interests from the higher income foothill communities that they're currently districted in.

You know, Pasadena, Sierra Madre, Monrovia, Glendora, Claremont, those parts of Upland even, those are, to me, too disparate when there's an opportunity and we have other visualizations that have those communities districted in with their working-class neighbors to the east. And so this piece feels really important to me to get right. And I -- while again, I agree that we should try to get the final architecture where we want it, for me, this is not where I want it. I would like to see something that is more comprehensive of what I view as the San Gabriel Valley.

CHAIR LE MONS: Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Thank you all so much for this direction. This is definitely something that I am happy to look at, make -- you know, and will not present anything that -- yeah, I'm happy to take a look at this. And we'll come back next week with my best effort to keep
these communities whole that the Commission is speaking on. And I think moving forward, I do understand the general more zoomed-out direction in this area. And again, I will just do my best to implement the wishes of the Commission.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Jaime.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I -- thank you, Jaime. I really appreciate that.

And I appreciate, Commissioner Vazquez, all of your -- you know, your personal experience and personal connection to this area. And I hear you. And I do get it. Like I get it. Like there are neighborhoods that are tied to each other in very different ways.

At the same time, however, I think very similar to, you know, the conversations even further north when we're talking about connecting Fresno and Bakersfield, you know, and we have folks saying, hey, we don't -- we're different, you know, keep us apart. And yet at the same time, when we look at all of the other factors that we're trying to weigh here, sometimes we're going to have to have communities in these very large humongous districts, as Mr. Becker identified, like sometimes they will have to connect together.

You know, and the good news is, you know, while we
need to get close to something finished for November 10th, we're going to have another chance to come back and rework this. So I just wanted to uplift that. But I feel like we're under some pressure now because that November 10th deadline for us is -- it's looming.

And so I'm really concerned about trying to put onto the line drawers like major architectural shifts at this point. But it's not going to be our last pass. And we'll have additional opportunities to think about these pieces. So thank you. And thank you --

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I want to just go on the record and just say that I am in complete agreement with Commissioner Vazquez. I mean, my father lives in Rosemead. He is not wealthy. He is on a fixed Social Security income very similar to many others in that community that share communities of interest with communities like Almonte, Baldwin Park.

I think it's not maybe as -- quite as drastic of a change. I think some of these foothill communities, wealthier communities like South Pasadena, Pasadena, Altadena, La Canada Flintridge, Sierra Madre, Monrovia, Arcadia, you know, along those -- those could be together. I understand that this is going to be a very large district. And so if it goes east-west and then
goes a little bit south, I think we can create a district that is both -- achieves that zero deviation and still also honors the different COIs that we do have in these districts, some which, you know, may not make complete sense.

You know, if, let's say, you know, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, and Diamond Bar, and Walnut stays in with Pico Rivera and Whittier, but you know, also keeping in mind that there's COI testimony for Downey and Norwalk to be in that, you know, maybe relooking at Long Beach. But maybe all of Long Beach is not going to be together too. I think that's the other kind of sacred cow that we have to be willing to, you know, break some eggs on. It's not what Long Beach wants. It's not like what we had asked for either. I think we wanted to try to honor that as best as we could.

But what I'm hearing is that because these are large districts, there are going to be, you know, different areas. But we can't say that any one place is going to be kept, you know, whole at all times. So I'm trying to just make sense of this. And perhaps, again, splitting it in that east-west kind of direction that groups together similar communities with other similar communities along the foothills. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that.
I just want to say that it sounds like the line
drawers have the direction. They can synthesize the
information. So I'd like to move beyond this discussion.
We have a lot more territory to cover. So if you have
something new to add to this discussion, I don't want to
shut that down, but we don't need anybody else to echo --
to back anybody else's position at this point. I'd like
to move forward.

Mr. Becker, is your hand up? Well, your hand is up.
Did you want to speak? Okay.

All right. Jaime, let's move on please.

MS. CLARK: We are going to start north. We're
going to start in the northernmost area of the county of
Los Angeles if everybody could please join me on page 41.

This visualization, again page 41 of the handout,
includes all of Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley,
and additionally a little bit of San Fernando Valley.
For population, I'm going to zoom in to this area. It is
Porter Ranch and Granada Hills North. These are areas
that have identified as potentially, you know, fitting
with the Santa Clarita Valley. And additionally I've
gotten some Commission direction to include those areas
with Santa Clarita. They're there for population right
now. And the percent deviation of this visualization is
.08 percent.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Chair.

Actually, I just wanted to do a brief comment based on the prior conversation -- is I just wanted to remind everyone that at our visualizations last week, we did not completely go over everything because we started to change the whole architecture of the maps. So in a sense, these -- this might be the first time we're really drilling down to it. And even if we're not, I don't see what -- I don't mind having major architectural changes.

I realize that some may be uncomfortable with that at this point. But I also know that once you get to live line drawing, that's super slow. So if we're going to make a major change, I'd prefer to do it now before we start getting into line -- live line drawing.

And I also don't want to stunt any of the comments from my fellow commissioners thinking that they can't give their input right now. So that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: I hope you don't think that -- this is Commissioner Le Mons. I hope you -- I hope none of the commissioners feel like you are stunted. I'm inviting your comments. But there is a point where, if we're communicating direction to the line drawer and they
have what they need and I've checked in with them, I will move the conversation forward.

We have to balance between long robust comments that are repetitive and the time that we need to get this completed. And we have a very, very tight timeline to get this project done. So I'm asking all the commissioners, you know, you can -- really want to get a point in there, but if the point has been made and has been received, then please try to accept that it has been made and received, even if you weren't the person to deliver it. So that's what I'm trying to balance here.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.

Maybe it's just my eyes. But on this visualization, AVSCV, the screen is showing .08 as a deviation, but the handout is showing .04. I just wanted to bring that to your attention and ask which one is the correct one.

MS. CLARK: -- so much. Yeah, this is the correct one. The one on the map is the correct one. Because this is just -- since last week, we've had, you know, one day to -- one and a half days to draw lines and then one more day to get out all these visualizations, my guess is that there was a slight computational error with the person who was creating the visualizations. And the correct percent deviation is on the map itself. And
thank you so much for that question.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thanks for that clarification.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, Jaime, you can continue.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much.

Next, page 42 please. This visualization is based in the San Fernando Valley. It includes Sylmar, the City of San Fernando, Pacoima, Foothill Trails district, Sun Valley area, Mission Hills, Arleta, North Hills, Panorama City, North Hollywood, Greater Valley Glen areas, Van Nuys, again this P-O-S-O, Poso, neighborhood area is not included in this visualization, Lake Balboa and Reseda. And this is a percent deviation of negative 1.24 percent.

And next, moving on to page 43 please, this visualization is negative 1.17 percent deviation. The change from last time is that Calabasas is no longer included in this visualization as Tamina pointed out to you just before I presented. This includes Chatsworth, Northridge, West Hills, Woodland Hills, Hidden Hills, Bell Canyon, Tarzana, Encino, Sherman Oaks, the Poso neighborhood, Studio City, areas in North Hollywood, also including Palisades all the way to Santa Monica, City of Topanga, and Malibu. And this is a negative 1.17 percent deviation.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I did read that for
this particular visualization -- or not this specific one -- but in the testimony from Equality California and other members of the LGBTQ community, they did speak to there being an LGBTQ plus COI as well as other area -- individuals, I guess residents in the area, spoke about Santa Monica, Tapanga, and Malibu being intertwined together. I know that the SHORELINE visualization is over by 4.6 percent. And this particular one is under by 1.21 percent.

Jaime, perhaps, we can look at splitting Santa Monica. I know it's not all of Santa Monica, but either splitting or perhaps moving all of Santa Monica into this visualization. I know it'll take the standard deviation up a little bit. But then maybe during line drawing, we can make little adjustments to the valley section of this particular visualization so that more of the valley can go back into the valley. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. You can continue, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much.

Next, moving on to page 44, this is the SHORELINE visualization. It includes Westwood and Westside Neighborhood Councils, Del Mar, Santa Monica, Marina del Rey. Excuse me. It in -- it does not include LAX per Commission direction, additionally including El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Gardena south
of Rosencrans, Lomita, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills areas.
This is a percent deviation of 4.72 percent.

CHAIR LE MONS: You can continue, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: And thank you so much.
Moving on to page 45 please.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa, your hand is still raised. Is that from before? Okay, thank you.

MS. CLARK: This visualization includes Sunland-Tujunga, not quite sure how to pronounce it, Glendale, La Crescenta, La Canada Flintridge, the very western part of Pasadena -- Pasadena is split in this visualization -- Eagle Rock, Glassel Park -- the northern part of Glassell Park, Silver Lake area, Hollywood Hills, Mid City Neighborhood Council, West Hollywood Beverly Hills, and Bel Air per Commission direction.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I want to also note that there was again from the LGBTQ community, there's a pretty significant COI in this particular area. Again, I want to just note that I know it's a little odd, but Beverly Hills with this particular COI seems not seeming to be together.

I also want to note that as we just talked about the San Gabriel Valley, if that, that CDWSGV, if that were to be created as more of a -- just a foothills communities
kind of COI or visualization, perhaps La Crescenta Montrose, La Canada Flintridge could be moved out of this GLEN2BA visualization. That may also help increase the numbers for the CDWSGV so that that could get to zero percent, perhaps also pulling in a little bit of the Malibu, San Fernando Valley visualization. If you move all of Santa Monica into it, maybe the North Hollywood, you know, Studio City, great Toluca Lake could be pulled into this to achieve a zero percent deviation, and whether or not it makes sense to move Beverly Hills to the SHORELINE so that they'll be with other similar communities. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, going back, I mean, these are all areas that are kind of connected. Going back up to that Antelope Valley district, I think it was in pink, I'm pretty sure -- is that -- can we take a look at the terrain layer there? I think we've received some testimony about those two little northern bits of the San Fernando Valley, that they're -- that there's -- yeah, that they're separated by a mountain range or some mountains. Yeah, the Porter Ranch, Stevenson Ranch. I think what the testimony had suggested is if possible, swapping Grenada Hills, Porter Ranch, Stevenson
Ranch for Sylmar, Pacoima, I believe. And perhaps, if anyone on staff could double-check that testimony that has come in, I would definitely want that to be evidence-based if we were to make that switch.

But I would be curious about populations and if that would work or not and what the longer ripple effects would be. I agree, actually, with -- and that could possibly even go into Sunland-Tujunga. I do agree with Commissioner Akutagawa on this. The Sunland-Tujunga linking all the way to Beverly Hills -- Sunland-Tujunga has almost a rural sort of feel to it like an urban/rural. I'm not sure exactly how they would qualify themselves. But certainly, you get like horses and things out in that area, whereas, you know, going into West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, definitely more of an urban area. So those -- I could certainly see the case for splitting up those regions.

I think the Sunland-Tujunga piece could go in other areas along with, as she mentioned, La Crescenta-Montrose, La Canada, whether that's in a foothill, whether that's towards Santa Clarita possibly, although I really like where we're going with the Antelope Valley in general. But I -- yeah, if we could -- I don't know if that's already been explored. I feel like it was mentioned previously, swapping Porter Ranch for Sylmar
and Pacoima.

But I don't know if you remember, Jaime, if you had looked at that.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much for that direction. I -- just because of in this plan and in senate, there were really big changes, I didn't have time to look at that. I do know that this area, Grenada Hills, Porter Ranch, is about 50,000 people. And I will look to do a switcheroo in this area that makes sense and aligns with the wishes of the Commission and testimony that we've received from the public.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Jaime.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa, is your hand raised from --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I also wanted to just note that Bel Air is also in this same visualization. So you have two uber wealthy areas in this visualization along with, as Commissioner Sadhwani had pointed out, kind of more rural -- I'm not saying that they're not wealthy either, but a definite difference in terms of urban versus ex-urban even.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, if I could ask a follow-up question to that actually. Last week I was asked to move Bel Air into this visualization. And so I'm just
wondering if not here, then where?

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, that was asked to be moved there because we would -- it was originally up in the valley. And that wasn't making sense. So we needed to move it down. It can go with the west, you know, the west end of Los Angeles or -- yeah, I mean, it would go kind of with the west end -- better with the west side of Los Angeles. It's kind of in the middle. But they even -- at one point, I think, we got a COI asking to be with the west.

I was raising my hand just -- on GLEN2BA, we did receive input that Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena share custody of the airport as well as others. I don't know how important that is. But I did want to -- since we're looking at, you know, how do we move things around a little bit, so Glendale -- Burbank, Glendale, Pasadena have been mentioned. And other COIs have mentioned Pasadena and Altadena. So there's kind of that corner there. If it's -- if you need, you know, to get to zero, if you take out that other -- I know we still at -- we have more than enough. But anyway, playing around, if you need to move in that direction.

MS. CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I just took a quick look. I also want to note that we did get some COI testimony about Toluca Lake and Studio City being -- from the LGBTQ community, being -- having a desire to be with the Hollywood communities as well too. So if that gives you some flexibility, I wanted to just note that as a COI. I know that the San Fernando Valley folks want to keep that part together. I think, like Long Beach, we're just looking at different options.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, I just want to make sure that we -- that both COIs were brought up and not just one so that people knew we were grappling with them both.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Jaime, go on please.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much.

Next, could we please look at page 46 in the handout? And this is the visualization called STHLA. This includes LAX, Inglewood, CANNDU, Watts Neighborhood Council, Willowbrook, Compton, East Rancho Dominguez, West Rancho Dominguez, the very northern part of Harbor Gateway. It includes a northern part of Gardena, Alondra Park, Lawndale, Hawthorne, Del Aire, Lennox. This is a percent deviation of 1.09 percent.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.
When we got to this one, it -- my notes popped up. You had asked where should Beverly Hills go. I had written a note down on -- it's the 10CORR. The 10CORR is negative 28,000-plus people. And the yellow one above it, the GLEN, it was up 23. So my note to myself was that you could start grabbing from Beverly Hills. So I guess where does Beverly Hills go towards the green where they're at negative, working on getting to zero as I -- as we've been instructed.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

Next, moving back to the visualization Commissioner Sinay was just speaking on, this is page 47 of the handout. This includes Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council, Pico, South Robertson, Palms, all of Culver City, Ladera Heights, View Park, Park Mesa, Empowerment Congress Central, Zapata King, Central Alameda neighborhood, South Central Neighborhood Council, these areas along 10 corridor, Olympic Park, Mid City, West Adams, Jefferson Park Neighborhood Council areas. This is a percent deviation of negative 3.69 percent.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Jaime, could you show us the black CVAP for this one as well as STHLA, please? I just want to see it.

MS. CLARK: Oh, yes. One moment. And, Commissioner
Yee, just the black CVAP on the label and the -- none of the other populations?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, please.

MR. BECKER: May I suggest maybe all of them?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure.

MS. CLARK: Now I'll read them all out loud. In this visualization, 10CORR, the Latino CVAP is 36.08 percent. Black CVAP is 31.11 percent. Asian CVAP is 9.29 percent. And white CVAP is 21.45 percent.

And then moving to the STHLA, Latino CVAP is 45.85 percent. Black CVAP is 39.36 percent. Asian CVAP is 4.06 percent. And white CVAP is 8.90 percent. And I'll zoom to look at both of those at the same time.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Is there a way to also -- and you know, put an -- the different -- is there heat maps or something that we can use in this area just because every single place is so different? Because I'm about to pull back my recommendation to go -- Beverly Hills to go into the green. I had said that based on our quick -- because there was no cities or anything in our PDF as I was acting quickly just to get to the numbers without looking more detailed. But I was wondering is there a --
do we ha -- do you have that layer like you had
originally when we first started all this?

MS. CLARK: Which CVAP would you like to see? I can
only show one at a time on the census block level.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we start with black,
please?

MS. CLARK: One moment. One moment please. I had
it saved, but this program didn't save it properly
unfortunately.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And in particular, I'm just
trying to look at kind of the yellow areas that we have.

MS. CLARK: I understand. One moment.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Since we're so under in those
areas, I'm just trying to figure out those different
pieces.

MS. CLARK: Here -- and I'm just going to change
this really quick so it's the same heat map that we've
been looking at the rest of the time. Okay. And I'll
get rid of this because it's not very helpful.

Okay. So the percent black CVAP is on the census
block level on the map. And, Commissioner Sinay, where
would you like to look?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: This is actually helpful
because it's kind of the whole -- all of it at once. Can
we -- when everyone feels like they've absorbed it well,
can we move to the Latino? And if you can shift it over a little bit to the right so that we're getting the whole -- the three. Okay, that's good. Thank you. And then if we can shift to Latino.

MS. CLARK: I'll remove the visualization layer so it's maybe a little easier to see. And the --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Would you be able to zoom out just one tick more? Thank you.

MS. CLARK: And one more time I'm going to remove this layer so the areas that are more sort of like darker reddish-orangish color have higher percent Latino CVAP. And again, this is on the census block level.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sorry to jump the line, but can you move this towards the Long Beach too because -- where is -- I just want to see all of that. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: And I'm going to remo -- turn the la -- make the labels smaller or rather remove the percent CVAP from this so that it is taking up less space on the map and hopefully more informative for all of you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then can we see Asian, please?

MS. CLARK: One moment. And again, I'll remove the visualizations layer.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I think the final one is Native American or indigenous.
MS. CLARK: We actually don't have that prepared in advance. I can bring it up now.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, that's fine.

MS. CLARK: And the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't --

MS. CLARK: -- percent indigenous CVAP in these visualizations is very, very low.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's what I -- okay. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh --

MS. CLARK: And --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- sorry. Can we see the white CVAP?

MS. CLARK: Yes, I also actually don't have that preloaded, but I --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- can --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: One moment please. The program is creating that map for you now. One moment. Oh, okay. And for this, maybe I can just read out the breakdown and not go through, to the same extent, with creating the breaks so that they make -- let me get this right for you so it'll be easy to see.
Okay. So I'm going to turn off the layer. So the
darker gray is higher percent white CVAP. The very
lightest gray is 0 to 13 percent then 13 to about 34
percent, 34 to 56 percent, 56 to 80 percent. And then
the very darkest gray is more than 80 percent white CVAP.
And this is on the census block level. And I'm going to
turn the visualization layer one more time.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks.
CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

We are coming up on a break shortly. How many more
visualizations do we have left for south -- for Los
Angeles?

MS. CLARK: One moment please. Let me count.

Three.
CHAIR LE MONS: Three, okay.

Let's continue for the next four minutes. We will
take a break at 3 o'clock. And then when we come back
from break, we will finish. And then we still need to
get through Southern California and public comments. So
I just ask commissioners to be judicious in their
direction. Let's keep it focused and directed.

Thank you, Jaime. Go ahead.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much.

I don't know if there are any other comments about
10CORR visualization.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. I wanted to take back my -- on 10CORR, not to go into Beverly Hills. But if we can try to get to the right -- to zero with 10CORR and NELA, keeping in mind the COIs that have been submitted. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

And next, we're going to go to page 48. I already received some feedback about this visualization. It is -- it includes San Pedro areas, Wilmington, Carson, West Carson, the western part of the City of Long Beach, Paramount, Lynwood, and South Gate. And this is page 48 of the handout. It is a 2.72 percent deviation.

And moving to page 51 of the handout, please, this is the NELA visualization. This includes East L.A., Boyle Heights, LA-32 Neighborhood Council, Lincoln Heights, Highland, Echo Park, part of Elysian Valley Riverside Neighborhood Council, Greater Cypress Park Neighborhood Council, also including this East Hollywood area to include Thai Town with the Koreatown Neighborhood Council, Historic Filipinotown, Kiko Union, Downtown Los Angeles, including Little Tokyo and the Chinatown community of interest. This is a percent deviation of 3.19 percent.

CHAIR LE MONS: You can continue.
MS. CLARK: Thank you.

And go -- the last visualization is on page 53. I have also received a lot of feedback on -- relating to this visualization. This is called CDWSGV. It includes Altadena, most of the City of Pasadena, South Pasadena, Alhambra, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel, Temple City, Arcadia, Sierra Madre, Monrovia, the northern part of Monrovia, I should say, the northern part of Glendora, Claremont, northern parts of Upland, Rancho Cucamonga. It includes all of San Antonio Heights, Lytle Creek, and Wrightwood and this forest area here to the north. This is a percent deviation of negative 1.66 percent.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you very much, Jaime. We appreciate it.

It's 3 o'clock. So we're going to go break.

Commissioner Akutagawa, we will take your comment when we return.

Also, when we return, it'll be 3:15. We will take whatever comments on Southern -- excuse me -- on Los Angeles and then move into Southern California. I will probably push back public comment for thirty minutes and start it at 4 o'clock so that people can start to cue up.

Our goal is to try to get through the remaining of the visualizations today and hear from the public to set us up for next week. So please keep that in mind as
you're on break and formulate your thoughts so you can be
concise. Thank you so much. Have a good break. We'll
be back at 3:15.

(Off the record at 3:00 p.m.)

(On the record at 3:14 p.m.)

CHAIR LE MONS: All right. Welcome back, everyone.

So just before break, we were in the final stages of the
visualizations for Los Angeles.

I understand that -- Commissioner Akutagawa, are you
back?

Does anyone else have any comments, final comments,
on Los Angeles? Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Chair, sorry. I'll just
pass for right now. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner.

Let's move to Southern California. Again, I want to
reiterate that we're going to start taking public comment
at 4 o'clock. The lines will close at 4:30. So there'll
be a thirty-minute window to get in the queue. And then
we will hear from those people who get in the queue.

So let's move on to Southern California, Andrew.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair. Today we're going
to be looking at --

CHAIR LE MONS: I'm sorry, Andrew. My apologies.

Commissioner Fornaciari, you had a comment?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I've got a philosophical struggle I'm going through here.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We've got a huge part of the state to get through. And in the end, we need to take public comment. And both of those things are important.

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: But there are numerous ways for the public to provide input to us. And there's only one way for us to do our work in public. And so you know, I'm kind of feeling that we're rushing this part a little bit.

I understand there are constraints. But I just want to share what was on my mind. And I don't know how my fellow commissioners are feeling about that. But I felt like I had to share.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Does other commissioners have comments on this?

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. Usually, I'm the one saying hey, we're rushing Southern California. And I kind of feel on all of these, to -- you know, I feel like we got one instruction. And we went back to the way we were doing
business before. And that's why it's taking a little bit longer versus looking at that deviation numbers and whatnot.

I take comfort on what's been said that once we're doing line drawing, we can still -- you know, there'll still be work to be done. And then if -- so I'd rather not rush it, but I know that the -- we still have an opportunity to get it right. And I would like to request again that next time we start in Central Valley and go south versus going north because it is much more complicated going south. And that's where we usually end up taking -- you know, that's where we usually run out of time.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. I don't want you to feel rushed. But I do think that you have enough experience with this process now that I think commissioners could be a lot more concise. That's my perspective.

So we're -where we are with time because of that lack of being concise as far as I'm concerned. So just keep that in mind. And we'll get as far as we get. And I'll try to, in the role of chair, balance between the needs that we have facing us today.

Andrew?

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

So we're going to go through and look at the
southern part of the state. And we have about fifteen --
we do have fifteen visualizations, four which are VRA
considerations. So similar to before, we will start off
with those.

One thing I just wanted to point out is we do have
some extra -- about 55,000 population down in San Diego
County that can be moved north into Orange. So that's
just one consideration to keep in mind as we look at
these. Otherwise, I will turn it over to Sivan. And she
will give us the visualizations. Thank you.

SIVAN: Good afternoon, everyone. Oh --
MR. DRECHSLER: Oh, I'm sorry. Chair --
CHAIR LE MONS: Sivan. Yes, I'm sorry. I was on
mute.

Sivan, before you start, Commissioner Sinay, did you
have another comment? Okay.

Go on, Sivan. Thank you.

SIVAN: Thank you so much, Chair.

All right. So just jumping right into this, we will
be on page 56. Just to kind of reorient everyone on the
labels, the first number is the number of people that the
deviation represents. The next number would obviously be
the deviation of the district. The next number is the
Latino CVAP and then black CVAP and then Asian CVAP.

If anyone has questions or a need for me to repeat
that, I'd be happy to do so. But I just wanted to start out with some of the visualizations that Mr. Becker might have comments on. I don't -- I believe only one of these is different from the last time you've seen this round of visualizations. So I will definitely point that out when we arrive there.

But beginning in southeastern corner, we have the SECA visualization. And as you can see, this encompasses several old -- these are also the old congressional district lines, which I can turn on or off depending on if it's helpful for Mr. Becker's commentary. But this is our first district.

And then zooming in over here, I also highlighted in yellow Jaime's areas, which have potential VRA considerations just because I was noting in the discussion we had leading up to this that, you know, obviously, these districts' visualizations are going to be the trickiest to kind of balance as we move towards those small deviations. So just as a reminder for commissioners that -- you know, I just thought the yellow coloring would be helpful as we continue these discussions.

So on page 57, you'll find POMONTFON, which encompasses Pomona, Chino, Ontario all the way up to the southern half of Upland as well as Fontana.
And then on page 58 is RIASB. And this is the one that changed just slightly since the last time you saw it. And I'm just going to turn off the current congressional districts to kind of highlight where those changes were from last week. This is a change that reflected a commissioner request to consider taking the southern -- to remove -- sorry, pardon me -- to remove Grand Terrace and Loma Linda as well as part of Grand Terrace. And then it moved the boundary, which split Redlands to be farther south to include Mentone. And that change is represented right here.

And, Mr. Becker, did you have anything to add about these visualizations?

MR. BECKER: No. If I'm reading this right, I think the other maps didn't have that number at the top. That number is the raw population that's either overpopulated or --

SIVAN: Yes.

MR. BECKER: -- underpopulated from the -- okay.

These are all, you know, just obviously incredibly close to the target area where you're talking about for deviation. So keep that in mind.

This is an area with strong VRA concerns. The Latino CVAP numbers are on the lower end here, consistent with some testimony we've seen, but possibly on the lower
end. It might be something we'd want to think about
given the strong VRA concerns, the strong racially
polarized voting we've seen in this area.
Sivan, can you scroll down to the southeast
district?
SIVAN: Absolutely. Just give me one second.
MR. BECKER: So this --
SIVAN: Would you like for me to zoom in on any
area, or is this --
MR. BECKER: No. No, I think that's okay. This --
SIVAN: Okay.
MR. BECKER: -- one does not -- this one, the level
is a di -- is at a higher level. And obviously, it's
zero deviation, which is really nice when you get to
twenty-five people off. I mean, you're getting to a very
nice target with regard to congressional districts. So
tremendous credit to the -- to you, Sivan.
I think the percentages here are something that
would be consistent with the concerns that we have found
with regard to the racially polarized voting we found in
this area.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, thank you.
In order to try to increase the population of that
San Bernardino, Rancho Cucamonga visualization as well as
hopefully increase the number of the Latino CVAP in that VRA district, so that RIASB, I'd encourage you to start grabbing some population from the north side of Redlands. And that purple -- that -- or that lavender district is slightly overpopulated. So I'm hoping that will help in that area. That's it for now.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commiss -- okay. I -- go on, Sivan.

SIVAN: Thank you so much.

All right. So we will now be on page 60. And we're just going to go back to the south to San Diego. So this is visualization SESDELC. And this did not change from the last time you saw it. So it goes as far south as National City. It does include Chula Vista or Bonita. It goes all the way to Rancho San Diego and all of El Cajon as well as part of the City of San Diego.

The next visualization is SDCOAST on page 61. The slight changes that were made on this visualization since last week were to move the northern border slightly south to exclude Fairbanks Ranch and Rancho Santa Fe and then also move the border farther east to include the Miramar military base, which you can see in this slightly darker shaded area right here. And I believe that was done in an effort to balance population.

The next visualization is on page 62. And that's going to be SMESCPOW. And that encompasses the City of...
Poway as well as Ramona, going as far north as -- let me zoom out just a little bit, see if you can get the whole picture -- one second -- as far north as Rainbow, but stops at the county line. It doesn't include Temecula.

The changes from last week are that -- some of the changes reflected in the SDCOAST -- oh, pardon me -- yeah, so this visualization adds in Rancho Santa Fe and Fairbanks Ranch as well as a small portion of Vista.

It lost -- oh, sorry. I'm reading off the wrong -- I'm so sorry. My notes -- pardon me. Let me just get.

Okay.

Yeah, so this lost the Miramar military area and a portion of Vista. And then it extended north to include Fallbrook, Rainbow, and Bonsall, which was not part of this visualization from last time, which I can just highlight right here. It grabbed all of this area and then lost this portion as well as this portion right here of the City of San Diego.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you so much, Sivan, for stepping in and doing such a great job in trying to understand the complexity of all of this.

I also want to thank the individuals from San Diego County for participating this week. We've gotten a lot of input. And we've been asking for input. And so now I
think we have a little bit better sense for some of the areas that Andrew kept saying well, I -- we need a little more information. I think we've got some this week.

And so this more general comments. And if you can -- you know, it's -- there are clusters of communities. And then we can work them around since we still have space to move and this is kind of the data that we were look -- we were waiting for to get from the community.

First thing is you had asked me yesterday for the kind of the neighborhoods for the LGBT community, like, where it would be on the map. And I will be honest. I just did a Google search. And it would be the -- on the north side, it will be the 8, on the west side, the 5.

Oh, do you want me to wait until you get there?

Sorry.

SIVAN: Oh, I'm --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If I'm --

SIVAN: Yeah, if -- you can keep going if no one else --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

SIVAN: Oh, I'm just going to turn on this layers.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, so the north, the 8, the west, the 5, south, the 94. And then this is where it gets a little complicated. It's -- you -- from 94, go to
805 going north until you hit Adams Boulevard. And then
go Adams to Fairmont and then Fairmont back to the 8.
And that was for the LGBT communities that you had asked
for. And I know that in the senate, we had split those
neighborhoods because we used the 163 as the cutoff.
And then the other two areas -- well, we've talked
about South Bay. And on this congressional map, we don't
have South Bay correct. And so I wanted to -- I want to
make sure that we get it correct, especially for
congress.
Again, it's Logan Heights. And I keep forgetting to
say Sherman Heights. So it's Barrio Logan, Logan
Heights, Sherman Heights, and San Diego, those three, and
then National City, Chula Vista, Bonita, Imperial Beach,
San Ysidro.
And so what we can -- you know, it'll be important
to keep them together. I understand this is a big
district. So I've got that.
And then the other one that we've received a lot
from -- there's -- I haven't had a chance to really look
at it. There -- two of the Chamber of Commerce have
created a website. And they have maps on there.
But basically, the community of interest is -- they
bring up El Cajon. And this is where El Cajon is
really -- you know, we heard yesterday keep El Cajon
together. And then others say El Cajon to the left. And then other people say El Cajon to the right. And that's why I say let's just split El Cajon and where we have the line is kind of where the communities differ. But for that -- for the rural east coast, sorry -- East County community, it's Alpine, Jamul, Lakeside, Santee, Poway, Ramona, and Borrego Springs. And so we've got a lot of that mixed in the yellow and in the green. And some of it is in -- in the blue. But as much as we can have them all in -- in the same district, that would be helpful. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Andrew.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair.

And thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

We will take a look at all of the direction. Appreciate that. And the one thing that -- we both will definitely be working with Mr. Becker on the -- sort of the VRA visualization that we have here and how keeping those neighborhoods that you mentioned and National City together in -- to see how that impacts this area. But you gave us some direction where we can make some of those changes. So thank you.

SIVAN: I just wanted to ask if Mr. Becker had anything else to add about some of those potential changes that were brought up by Commissioner Sinay.
MR. BECKER: No, I think we'll need to see where that leads us. But because that SECA district is so well-drawn with zero deviation and with over 57 percent Latino CVAP in an area of VRA concern, there is some flexibility there that we can probably look in -- look to use.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Really quickly I just have a clarifying question for Commissioner Sinay.

Did I hear correctly that you said you Googled something? And then if I heard that correctly, can you please share what you Googled to inform your direction?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I looked up the neighborhoods that were given to us in our COI testimony. And then I looked on a map to see exactly where they were.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

No, I just wanted to -- I believe David Becker and Andrew, they -- I was a little concerned that so much of this VRA was being split up. I just want to make sure we still maintain the integrity of the VRA. And it appears that they will. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Sivan, continue please.

SIVAN: Thank you so much, everyone.
All right. Just resuming --

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. I'm sorry, Sivan.

Yes, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

I wanted to ask, you had said there's, I think, 57,000 people, Andrew, that need to go north. And I wasn't quite understanding that.

And then I just -- one last piece around Camp Pendleton because that's also really important to the community -- we've split Vista. And if possible, ideally, we'd keep Vista together with Carlsbad and -- and Camp Pendleton.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

And what I was just pointing out was the districts not including this VRA district that is on the eastern part of San Diego. If you were to look at the other districts going north-south, the total population's about 55,000 over ideal. But we will see how that impacts with some of the other changes.

But I just wanted to give you and the commissioners heads up to -- well, we -- you know, if we did nothing with the VRA visualization, you know, we would be having to shift some of the population up -- not a big thing.

But as we start to think about getting to zero, I just wanted to flag that population may need to be moving
north. But based on some of the direction you just gave us in that -- in the -- in those districts of keeping National City, you know, with -- in the southern part, that may have some impact. So we will -- we'll definitely make those changes and keep you posted.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, Sivan?

SIVAN: All right. So we should be on page 63, which is the SDCOAST district that stretches into southern Orange County. And the changes that we made in this visualization since the last time you've seen it are to add in Rancho Santa Fe and Fairbanks Ranch as well as the small portion of Vista that was split.

It loses Fallbrook, Rainbow, and Bonsall. And it adds in Aliso Viejo to the other southern OC coastal cities cluster. And you can see those changes a little bit more clearly here.

And this took into account commissioner direction or attempted to follow commissioner direction to add Vista with Oceanside. So more of Vista was added, although for population balance reasons, the whole city was not able to be added. But we can definitely play around with that as it's been clear in direction from commissioners that that is a desire to keep Vista with Oceanside and Camp Pendleton. So we're going to keep playing around with that combination.
Continuing north, on page 64, the NOCOAST visualization, the only change in this visualization since the last time you've seen it is to exclude the City of Stanton. This followed a commissioner request to remove Rainbow, Fallbrook, and Bonsall. And it did -- we also received some direction to include Los Alamitos and Rossmore in with this NOCOAST district.

If that still stands as a piece of direction, I can continue to play around with that. But as you can see, I think with the current deviation it tipped it a little bit too far. But we could definitely continue to try that if commissioners so desire.

Moving to page 65, this is the SAVANAANA visualization. And zoomed in a bit too much. Sorry about that.

All right. So this visualization now includes the City of Stanton as it was lost from this purple district right here previously. It also moves slightly farther into Anaheim Hills for population balance and splits the western half of the City of Orange along the 55.

This was following commissioner instruction to add in the City of Stanton and also keeps in mind commissioner direction to not split the City of Santa Ana.

Should I pause at this point for comments, or should
I continue, Chair?

CHAIR LE MONS: Continue. I'm keeping an eye on co --

SIVAN: Okay. Thank you so much. Okay. I'll just trust you'll interrupt me. That's perfect.

Okay. Page 66 is the OCSBLA area. And this is, as you can see, our most unbalanced district visualization at the moment. So right now, this is underpopulated by about 10 percent deviation.

I believe that the reason for this large deviation was mostly in -- kind of running up against these VRA consideration visualizations in L.A. County. And I think with the quick turnaround in trying to incorporate commissioner instructions from last week, this was one of the pieces that we were not able to kind of iron out. So this definitely leaves a lot to kind of adjust. So would be open to hearing any comments about this visualization.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, thank you.

I actually want to go back. I hear you on this, Sivan. And I think, totally fair, right, that we're balancing a lot of different priorities. So we're going to see that in some districts. And, clearly, we see it here.

And if we go back down to where the Costa Mesa line
was.

SIVAN: So if I zoom in further?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: With -- I'm sorry. Well, was Costa --

SIVAN: If I zoom --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- Mesa included in this district last week? I'm trying to remember. I know it certainly wasn't on the assembly level last -- one set of visualization.

SIVAN: Yeah, it was.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It was included last week?

SIVAN: Yes. The red line is last is the 10/27 version.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, got it. So this has largely stayed the same.

SIVAN: Yes, except for this northern part where Stanton is moved into the Santa Ana district.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. So a couple things. So stemming from L.A. County and Long Beach, I know several of us gave the direction that as we reconfigure Long Beach to try and keep it whole, that it's reasonable to continue -- you know, we've gotten a lot of testimony about keeping coastal areas together. And while keeping the solid coast of just one county is -- seems problematic at this point, it seems unlikely. You know,
keeping parts of Long Beach with Seal Beach, possibly
down into Huntington if need be, seems reasonable. That
would definitely start cutting into this area.

Costa Mesa, we've had a lot of testimony linking it
to Irvine and Tustin, not with Little Saigon. That
leaves Newport Beach, probably parts of Huntington Beach
that we need to think about and reconfigure. So I
definitely think that there's going to be breaks in this
area. I would prioritize putting Costa Mesa back with
Irvine and Tustin.

We gave this direction, I think it was yesterday.
The days are all mixing together for me, so either with
assembly or senate. But having Costa Mesa come back into
that area. And I think from there I would say let's see
what happens because we're getting a lot of testimony.
So I don't want to get too in the weeds. But I think
those two big architectural pieces, the piece coming down
out of Long Beach, and then Costa Mesa back into Irvine,
Tustin, I'd be curious to see what ripple effects that
has pretty much everywhere else.

SIVAN: Absolutely. Thank you so much.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. On the OCSBLA, it
looks to me like Chino Hills' population is almost -- is
very close to your shortage in the OCSBLA. I haven't
gfigured -- I haven't finished figuring out where to pull
population from to rebalance the southwest Riverside
district. But if we did move Chino Hills into OCSBLA,
that would almost, in one fell swoop, eliminate that
imbalance in that district. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I want to just speak
to that NOCOAST one and I believe that Westminster,
Fountain Valley, Garden Grove needs to be pulled out of
the coastal communities. We're talking about, again,
very different communities, working class versus more
wealthy coastal communities. And we also heard
significant COI testimony, particularly yesterday, there
were several. And earlier in our process during the COI
input meetings there was requests to keep the Orange
County coast in its entirety as one -- or treated as one
community of interest. I do realize that we may be
looking at breaking things up. I think -- I want to
repeat what Commissioner Fernandez had said about also
being comfortable about re-architecting some of this.

I would suggest that we move Westminster, Garden
Grove, Fountain Valley, Midway City in together,
possibly, at the very least, with Cypress, Buena Park,
and with Fullerton. And what I'm going to suggest is
it's -- it may be a possibility of just eliminating this
district that we have -- OCBLA, I think -- and then
moving Brea into the -- in with a possible visualization
with communities to the north of LA. And then moving
Yorba Linda -- and if also moving Brea and Placentia --
either -- maybe Placentia with Fullerton. I think I read
COI testimony that said Placentia and Fullerton should be
together. But move Brea to the north and then move Yorba
Linda, Anaheim Hills, Villa Park, and that western part
of Orange in with the OCINLAND. And that may also,
potentially, help with some of the numbers there as well
too.

CHAIR LE MONS: Ms. Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just wanted to agree
with Commissioner Akutagawa in that. I do think we have
also heard testimony that a lit -- parts of Huntington
Beach are also, possibly aligned with Little Saigon. So
I'm almost wondering if -- I mean, Huntington Beach are
fairly large place. If we need to be pulling from
Huntington Beach to support up into Long Beach, as well
as supporting -- I'm using my cursor here and no one can
see it -- using parts of the more inland components of
Huntington Beach to support the Little Saigon areas, I
could see making this cut like that possibly. Yes,
exactly right in that area, if need be. That's only if
for population. I never want to separate a city, but if
we have to. We've had a lot of testimony from this area
and I think those -- that's some of the areas where we
might be looking.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I do want to just
say that testimony that we received from -- it's very
conflicted. But testimony that we've also received, in
terms of COI input from community advocates from this
area, Huntington Beach is not part of Little Saigon,
neither is Los Alamitos and Rossmoor. Yes, there may be
some pockets of individuals that live in these areas, but
it is certainly not part of Little Saigon.

Seal Beach may make sense to put together with Long
Beach. I think it just depends on who you ask, but being
neighboring cities, I -- you know, it -- I think that
there's a lot of shared back and forth commerce between
them, given along the shoreline, particularly. PCH, you
know, Seal Beach and Long Beach are fairly close together
there. And so you know, those are perhaps some of the
calculus's of this big Jenga that we're doing here. So
but I would say that Huntington Beach does not
necessarily reflect a similarity with Little Saigon and I
would just be a little careful about pulling that
immediately and perhaps look to other places first.
Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Continue, Sivan.

SIVAN: Thank you so much. I believe we left off with the SAVANAANA districts, so I will move into the OCSBLA. Oh, we did cover this one, my apologies. What I will highlight is, yes, that these -- this area right here was not included last week but I've definitely gotten some very good ideas from commissioners about how we can sort of shuffle this area around.

The next visualization will be on page 67 for OCSINLAND, everyone's favorite name. And the changes in this visualization from last week are that it loses Aliso Viejo, as well as part of Orange that was previously included from last version. It extends eastward to include Silverado, Trabuco Canyon, Rancho Santa Margarita, and Coto De Caza, as well as the mountainous area of this kind of upper Orange County. And it goes all the way up to the Orange County border. And this is a slightly negative deviation at the moment. And --

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I also wanted to comment. I notice that there was COI testimony around the border between Fullerton and Anaheim, and that a portion of that southern Fullerton section also has working class families. And I think the SAVANAANA, that
one has a negative 3.20 deviation. Perhaps, pulling in some of the portions of that southern Fullerton area may help balance that one out, which then, with the other changes to the OCSBLA and the OCSINLAND one, we might be able to get to a place where we'll be able to balance that. And there's a 2.5 percent deviation I see for the south Orange County, northern San Diego, so you know, taking maybe a little bit from there may balance out that whole section. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Continue, Sivan.

SIVAN: All right. So this SWRIV visualization goes as far north as Chino Hills, wraps around Norco to Woodcrest, and then it goes as far south as Temecula, and then wraps all the way around the Orange County border.

The differences from last week are that it adds Chino Hills, while losing Silverado and the other mountainous regions of Orange County. And I'll just highlight that with the last week's lines. You can see it loses all of this area and adds Chino Hills.

The next visualization is on page 69 and this is the Morongo MORCOA. And there were no changes in this visualization since the last time that you saw it. Let me just zoom out to give you a better look. And I'd be happy to zoom in again, if anyone needs a detail -- a more detailed shot.
And then that will bring us to the final visualization for our congressional districts on page 70. This is the BEAVICAL visualization. And the changes that we made in this vis were to swap with the RIASB visualization to include Grand Terrace and Loma Linda, while losing that northern portion of Redlands and Mentone, which we heard some feedback about potentially adjusting that a little bit further. And this was following -- let's see. So there was a request to add Wrightwood into this visualization, but I believe this pushed the deviation a little bit too high because removing from the CDWSGV visualization would push it even further into the negative. And so any instruction on what, potentially, to swap out to include Wrightwood to make that possible, would be helpful, if that is still a desired change.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Actually, sorry. Can you zoom in and then, Sivan, if you could repeat that question you had, just so I make sure I understand where -- what areas you're looking at.

SIVAN: Yeah, absolutely. One second. So I believe that last week there was a request from commissioners to consider adding Wrightwood into this visualization. And I believe, because these two are so close to zero, but
this one is already in the negative and this one is  
slightly positive, that moving Wrightwood in would just  
tip that a little bit, you know, further in the wrong  
direction. So if commissioners had -- still wanted us to  
try and incorporate Wrightwood, just looking for what  
would be swapped out, potentially, or if there are other  
changes that are desired for this week.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm -- I feel less concerned  
about putting in Wrightwood at this point in this  
visualization. And like I said, I think to balance the  
lavender, the BEAVICAL district, if you pull some  
population from the north side of Redlands, you may be  
able to solve both of those issues.

SIVAN: Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yep.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. On that note and  
maybe Commissioner Vazquez or someone who might know  
better -- Pinon Hills and Phelan were noted in several  
COI testimonies as having a community of interest with  
Wrightwood. Would it make more sense to pull them out  
and pull them into the CDWSGV? And on that one, given  
the directions that we gave to Jaime, we may be looking  
at restructuring that one. And so there may be a way to  
balance out the deviations there. I also want to note
that I noticed that there was COI -- lots of COI input from Rancho Cucamonga asking to be in a mountain district with San Antonio Heights and I don't know if that also gives some additional flexibility, as that CDWSGV is perhaps restructured too. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Any additional feedback on SOCAL visualizations? Well, I want to thank the commissioners for being very targeted with their feedback and we actually got through that.

So Commissioner Fornaciari, I hope it was robust enough, and is there anything you want to add? I've got three minutes for you.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I just wanted to make sure that commissioners felt like they had the space to say what was on their mind, without being rushed. I mean --

CHAIR LE MONS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You know, I think we need to balance it and so I appreciate the input. I think folks got to say what they had to say and that we have an opportunity to hear from the public. So I just want to make sure the commissioners have had time.

CHAIR LE MONS: All right. Yeah, we checked all the boxes. Thank you.

So with that, let's move to public comment and we have a robust queue.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, Chair. In order --

CHAIR LE MONS: Hi, Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Hello. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the live stream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the live stream feed. It is 845-952-1762 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator.

When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says, "the host would like you to talk" and to press star 6 to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to give your name to give public comment. Please make sure to mute your computer or live stream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak and again, please turn down the live stream volume. And we will be giving a thirty-
second warning and fifteen-second warning for the two-
minute public comment period.

We will be starting with caller 2041 and up next
after that will be caller 2647. Caller 2041, if you will
please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by
pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. HAKIMI: Good afternoon. My name is Ahron
director of Kern Council of Governments, the federally
designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for Kern
County. And I wanted to comment on the MADERAKERN 1102
district. I'm very concerned about the size of the
district. Two hundred and twenty-nine miles from
Rosemont to Oakhurst, and the fact that Kern County would
be competing with Fresno for precious transportation
funds. As you -- as you may know, NPOs deal with federal
and state transportation funds. We already are
considered a step-child to Fresno because the main office
for Caltrans for the seven San Joaquin Valleys and
Fresno.

I'm very, very concerned that our influence in Kern
County would be even further diluted by having us compete
with Fresno. Especially, when it comes to competing for
federal and state grants where the congressional district
is always identified in those grants. As an example, a
grant could be given to Fresno County and the response to us down in Bakersfield, in Kern County, well, your district got a grant. Please reconsider --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds, sir.

MR. HAKIMI: -- the size of this district being so big. Two hundred and twenty-nine miles is greater than the distance between New York and Washington D.C. And the fact that you're including the two largest cities in the same district in San Joaquin Valley. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 2647 and up next after that will be caller 3979.

Caller 2647, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. KELLISON: Thank you. This is Heidy Kellison. That's H-E-I-D-Y, last name Kellison, K-E-L-L-I-S-O-N. I'm calling as a twenty-year advocate for communities most in need in Yolo County. In particular, I currently serve as a First 5 Yolo commissioner and so my comments are not a representation of a First 5 Yolo position, but I will provide my observations in advocating for our community.

Yolo County is the most impoverished county in our state and it is also rural, which means services are much
harder to provide to our residents who are most in need.

It is my job, as a commissioner, to make sure that children ages zero to five and their families have a good start in life. And so because of our small size and our reducing tobacco tax revenues, we are required to establish very deep and meaningful partnerships with our governmental and private partners to -- partners. And that, of course, includes our elected officials. Yolo County is most benefitted when it is whole for adequate representation of these very, very impoverished communities. Carving an already small community into smaller pieces really diffuses the voices of those who are in need, and it favors those in more prosperous and --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. KELLISON: -- neighboring communities. It is particularly acute for communities like Winters, which is not -- it doesn't have a geographical nexus like, say, West Sacramento does for the City of Sacramento. So my request is that you make Yolo County whole in these lines. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 3979 and up next after that will be caller 4359. I apologize. After that will be caller 4183.
Caller 3979, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. FIFITA: Greetings. My name is Melenaite Fifita. I am with the Pacific Islander Health Partnership, a nonprofit organization based in Garden Grove. We at Pacific Islander Health Partnership acknowledge and appreciate the Commission's continued efforts and hard work that have gone into these district visualizations. I wanted to comment on the community's interest in Garden Grove and Westminster. West Garden Grove and Westminster are home to some of the nation's largest Vietnamese American communities. These cities are also home to notable Korean American, and native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, an HPI population. West Garden Grove, Westminster, west Santa Ana, and north Sun Valley should be drawn together, preferably, with other immigrant communities. Our community of interest are respected in some visualizations, but divided in others. At the state assembly level, our community of interest is together. Thank you.

At the state senate level, our community of interest was divided. And we understand that the Commission may be required to draw Voting Rights Act district in Orange County at the state senate level. So any hopes I'll be working in the area should draw our community of interest
together in an adjacent district.

At the congressional level, our community of interest is kept together, but drawn into a more prosperous coastal district. Across all levels, state --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. FIFITA: -- state senate and congressional levels, the map submitted by the People's Redistricting Alliance does the best job of being attentive to the communities of interest's long history throughout Orange County, including the native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander communities. We urge you to consult those maps for the best overall design --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. FIFITA: -- for any needs and current challenges and changes within our communities. To the Commission, you guys are great. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 4183 and up next after that will be caller 4359.

Caller 4183, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. SLADE: Good afternoon. My name is D-E-E, last name is Slade, S-L-A-D-E. I am the president of the African American Network of Kern County. I urge the Commissioners to revisit the map Madera --
VCD_MADERAKERN_1102. I feel that linking Fresno and Bakersfield would not help Kern County. As a matter of fact, it might disrupt some of the advancements that we are making here in Kern, especially in our labor force. And someone recently spoke about the transportation. So I definitely would urge the commissioners to revisit and not consider linking Kern County with Fresno. It would make us lose some of the funding that we're already entitled to, as well as our representation in the senate, as well as the congressional. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 4359 and up next after that will be caller 5056.

Caller 4359, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. VALERO: Hello. Hello, my name is Eddie Valero and I am a Tulare County supervisor, representing District 4, and the comments are my own. I would just like to applaud the Commission for the KINGATULARE assembly map; I think it is a great map. However, I would encourage the Commission to consider keeping Visalia whole in a different district, as it does take portions of the north. And instead include communities like Woodlake, Lemon Grove, Lindcove into that frame, because of the many other unincorporated communities that
need a voice for the county of Tulare, but also in Kings County, as well.

Many times, we are often labeled as the armpit of California, but I believe we are the heart of California. And I believe we need greater representation with these unincorporated communities. I represent eleven unincorporated communities already in northern Tulare County, and they have been urging and yearning for representation. So again, just to reiterate, I would take out the Visalia portion north and extend it to the communities of Woodlake, Lemon Grove, and Lindcove.

Thank you so much and I appreciate this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 5056 and up next after that will be caller 6873.

Caller 5056, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Susan (ph.) and I'm with Addie (ph.) for Justice. We're an organization that works with members in Orange County, primarily Fullerton and Buena Park. I just want to start by thanking the Commissioner for the work that you've done. And thank you Commissioner Akutagawa for the helpful suggestion in Orange County.

I wanted to comment on the community of interest in
south Fullerton and west Anaheim. Low income immigrant communities in these two cities share common challenges like environmental justice and access to affordable housing. Across all levels, south Fullerton and west Anaheim should be drawn together and apart from more affluent communities, such as Yorba Linda and Anaheim Hills. Unfortunately, our community of interest is not represented in most of the visualizations. The state assembly level is, perhaps, the best of the three. While district CADNOC_1102 does, generally, connect the two communities. It could be strengthened by moving the parts of west Anaheim closest to south Fullerton into the district and this would better represent our COI.

At the state senate level, south Fullerton and west Anaheim are divided. The two communities should be united in a federal Voting Rights Act district. And because there is not a required VRA district in OC at this level, I do think that a reworking of Orange County state senate districts would be needed.

And then at the congressional level, the south Fullerton and west Anaheim COI is divided between districts BCDSSA_1102 --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: -- and BCDOSCCLA_1102. And we ask that you unite the south Fullerton and west Anaheim
MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: -- in both VRA districts. And yeah, thank you so much to the Commission for your time and for drawing these maps.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 6873 and up next after that will be caller 7558.

Caller 6873, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you. My name is Barbara (ph.). And as a grower in Kern County, I'm concerned about tying Kern County and Fresno together, because of our competing water issues. The majority of Kern County growers receive their water from the Kern County Water Agency through the State Water Project. Fresno, however, receives water from other sources and by combining Kern and Fresno, the projections and interest of Kern growers will be diluted. So I would like to ask that Kern County and Fresno not be linked together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have caller 7558 and up next after that will be caller 9921.

Caller 7558, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. One more time, caller
7558, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Sorry about that. Thank you. I'm encouraged to hear so many phone calls, calling about the Kern, Madera combination and how that won't work, because I believe the same thing. I don't believe that this combination of Kern and Fresno Counties will be fair to the people of both counties. Both counties expect equivalent treatment, expect representation, and we're just very two distinct communities, and we need representation for each community. Huge, huge thank you for your time. And I have noted, as a citizen, I'm also very impressed by the many people who are in positions of influence who are calling in. But I'm a citizen, a mom, but I've heard that the majority of calls seem to be calling about the Kern, Madera combination and how that would be unfavorable, unfair and disenfranchising for so many. And I hope that you're noticing that too. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 9921 and up next after that will be caller 0018. Caller 9921, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.
MS. CROWSON: Hi, good afternoon. Thank you for your time. My name is Florence Crowson. That's F-L-O-R-E-N-C-E C-R-O-W-S-O-N. I'm with the United Domestic Workers of America, and I am a lifetime resident of Merced County. And I want to keep Merced with the Fresno and not combine it with the foothills, because we should keep Merced whole and in one district. There is too much risk to split Merced into congressional districts. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have caller 0018 and up next after that will be caller 0073.

Caller 0018, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

MALE SPEAKER: Yes, yes. Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MALE SPEAKER: Great. So my name's Jeff (ph.) and I'm calling regarding east Ventura County, Simi Valley, specifically. I've looked at a lot of those visualizations and I believe that the VICA 8038 map is -- is the most logical map. I see a current visualization that has Simi Valley with Malibu and that just doesn't make a lot of sense to me. I think Simi Valley,
Moorpark, and Santa Clarita being together in the assembly map is much more in line with the communities of interest principle. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 0073 and up next after that will be caller 0247.

Caller 0073, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi, commissioners. My name is Mike. I am calling on behalf of Equality California about the congressional visualization NORTHSANM. I want to thank the Commission for the robust discussion today about keeping San Francisco's LGBTQ plus community of interest together. In particular, we'd like to thank Commissioner Sadhwani for her attention to our testimony about how to structure the southern border of this visualization. I continue to urge the Commission to include all of the west of Twin Peaks in NORTHSANM and to reduce the deviation by moving Cayuga Terrace, Crocker-Amazon, Excelsior, Ingleside, Merced Heights, and Mission Terrace out. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 0247 and up next after that will be caller 0565.

Caller 0247, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. DELEON: Hello, good afternoon. My name is Manny DeLeon (ph.). I'm a resident of Irvine and I am with the Orange County Asian and Pacific Islander Community Alliance, OCAPICA for short. I would like to take this opportunity to appreciate the Commission's work and this redistricting process, and the efforts to consider the communities' comments in shaping our district. That being said, I wanted to comment on districts in and around Irvine, in Orange County.

Communities in Irvine and Costa Mesa face common challenges related to affordable housing, language access, and similar concerns. The two cities should be kept whole, joined together, with parts of Tustin and away from more affluent coastal communities, like Newport Beach and Laguna Beach. I want to thank you all for moving in the right direction within the governor's second visualizations, but want to identify a few remaining problems.

At the state's assembly level, while Irvine is kept together with Tustin in a district -- in a visualization district, Costa Mesa is the dividing mark from Irvine, Costa Mesa, and Tustin communities of interest. We ask that you unite our COI by drawing Costa Mesa whole into this district with Irvine and Tustin. Costa Mesa is not
part of Little Saigon and has much more in common with these communities. But please do this without dividing the (indiscernible) COI to the north as well. On the state level -- on the state senate level, our COI is kept together, but draw in two more affluent coastal communities of interest with which it is not aligned. We understand that the Commission may be required to draw a very district in Orange County at the state senate level, so any wholesale to be reworked in the area should draw these three cities together --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. DELEON: -- and away from the coast.

At the congressional level, we also see that while Irvine is kept whole and together with Tustin, our COI is divided by drawing Costa Mesa into adjacent coastal districts. Again, we ask that our COI be kept whole by drawing Costa Mesa into the same inland district as Irvine, Tustin.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. DELEON: Across all levels, the maps submitted by the People's Redistricting Alliance do the best job of respecting communities of interest throughout Orange County, including ours. We urge you to consult this map for the best overall architecture for implementing these important changes. And thank you so much for all the
work --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 0565 and up next after that will be caller 1015.

Caller 0565, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. JONES: Yes. Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. JONES: Okay. Hi, my name is Jennifer Jones and I am a resident of Simi Valley. And thank you, commissioners, for taking public comment and listening to the public in regards to what they -- their concerns and issues in getting feedback in regards to the visualizations. I'm hoping that we can keep Simi Valley whole. I'm hoping that we can keep Simi Valley with Santa Clarita.

We have a lot in common with Santa Clarita, as I've stated numerous times before and I'm sure you're probably tired of me calling in. But we share aerospace, we share the film industry, we share horses, we share first responders. We're both prone to wild fires. Our geographics are really, really similar, because they're both mountain areas. We share our law enforcement whenever there's -- especially in regards to human trafficking, which is a big deal actually. I'm sure you
guys realize that. We share information with law
enforcement to help them out to save human trafficking
victims. Also, in regards to drug busts, you know,
our law enforcement assists the law enforcement over in
Santa Clarita to make that happen.

And then also, you know, there's Magic Mountain. So
everybody I know in Simi Valley has a season pass.
Everybody I know in Simi Valley loves going --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. JONES: -- to Magic Mountain, and visiting Santa
Clarita afterwards, and eating and visiting that
wonderful bedroom community, just like Simi Valley is a
bedroom community. The house prices are very similarly
priced. And we did get a minority --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. JONES: -- growth here in Simi Valley. So I
hope when you're drawing your map for state and
congressional, you will consider keeping Simi Valley
whole and Simi Valley with Santa Clarita.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. So
right now, we have caller 1015 and up next after that
will be caller 1716.

Caller 1015, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star 6. The floor is
yours.
MR. HARVEY: Thank you. My name is Jim Harvey. I'm president of the Homestead Valley Community Council. I want to start off by thanking the Redistricting Commission for all your hard work and also thank you for this opportunity to comment. I have two comments -- two requests, actually.

I want to talk about page 69 in the visualization, more specifically, VCD_MORCOA, the light blue area in San Bernardino County. The district -- or the -- excuse me. The community boundaries for Homestead Valley are inadequately expressed on the maps that were supplied to the Commission. Homestead Valley is actually larger than that. It's missing the upper northwest dog leg; that community is Johnson Valley. And so I'd like to request that the Commission verify that with the San Bernardino County -- in the San Bernardino County general plan. More specifically, the Homestead Valley community plan. You'll see that our community is larger. Why that's important is because in this congressional district map, that only is one of our subcommunities. Where I live, Johnson and Valley split, but we're also split -- it also splits Homestead Valley. That's important to us to keep Homestead Valley together.

The second comment I want to make is that Homestead Valley more closely relates to the communities to the
north and west of us, like Lucerne Valley, Adelanto, Hesperia. And we're less related to the communities south of us, especially in the Coachella Valley area. So my request would be that you move Homestead Valley. First, recognize it in its entirety and then move Homestead Valley community into VCDBEA --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. HARVEY: -- BICVAL 1102, which is the light violet district to the north of it. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 1716 and up next after that will be caller 2115.

Caller 1716, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. LU: Okay, yes. Thank you. My name is Bruce Lu (ph.). I'm a resident of Westminster City. I did make my comment on the visualization website, so I hope you can read it. So it's important that Little Saigon's included in the city of Midway City, Westminster, Garden Grove, and Fountain Valley, Seal Beach, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, and Huntington Beach. We don't have anything in common with Costa Mesa. Everything we do like making sure my children can attend Vietnamese Language School in Westminster like while we live in Los Alamitos is good point. My parents in Huntington Beach they both are
still going to the Vietnamese grocery store next door and
now we have Vietnamese restaurant in Huntington Beach.
So please keep the Westminster, Garden Grove, Midway
City, Huntington Beach, Los Alamitos, Fountain Valley,
Seal Beach, and Rossmoor kept together. And thank you
for listening and for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now, we have caller 2115 and up next after that will be
caller 2232.

Caller 2115, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.
Caller 2115, you are unmuted. Can you hear me? You may
want to double check and make sure your phone is not
muted.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. The floor
is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: All right, great. Thank you for
taking the time to hear me. I worry that the new
congressional districts in the Central Valley will change
our accessibility and the availability of our elected
representatives, relating to a lot of different
geographical area. And it would -- they'd have very
little time to actually listen to communities and
consider what those communities need, as they represent
them. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 2232 and up next after that will be caller 2600.

Caller 2232, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. ASATO: Hello. My name is Kayla, Kayla Asato, I'm a Orange County resident, City of -- resident of the City of Orange and I'm an Orange County Environmental Justice. Again, as always, I'd like to thank and appreciate the Commission for all of your hard work. And also thank you to the commissioner who made note of the community of interest testimony to separate south Fullerton from the rest of north Fullerton, because of the shared socioeconomic status and demographic statuses.

I wanted to comment on that community of interest in south Fullerton and west Anaheim, and affirm what the previous commissioner -- what the commissioner said. Low-income and immigrant communities in these two cities share common challenges like environments of justice, access to affordable housing, being attacked by police brutality. And across all levels, south Fullerton and west Anaheim should be drawn together and apart from more affluent communities, like in Yorba Linda, like in Anaheim Hills.
And unfortunately, our community of interest is not respected in most of the visualizations; hopefully, things will change. The state assembly is probably the best of the three. And while the assembly district NOC 1102 does, generally, connect these two communities, it could be strengthened by moving the parts of west Anaheim closest to south Fullerton into the district, instead of the other parts. This better represents our communities of interest.

And at the state senate level, south Fullerton and west Anaheim are divided. These two communities should be united in a federal Voting Rights Act district, because we do not draw a required VRA district in Orange County at this level. We think a dramatic reworking of the Orange County state senate district is needed.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ASATO: At the congressional level, the south Fullerton and west Anaheim COI is divided between BCDSSA 1102 and BCDOCSBLA 1102, we ask that you unite the communities in south Fullerton and west Anaheim into the VRA district, which makes the district more effective for Latinx community. And across all levels, the maps invented by the People's Redistricting Alliance do the best job of representing communities of interest throughout Orange County, including ours.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 2600 and up next after that will be caller 3100.

Caller 2600, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. PAVION: Hello. My name is O'Neal Pavion (ph.) with Orange County Voter Information Project. But I am also a resident of Stanton, in Orange County. Today, I wanted to, before anything, I really thank the whole Commission for the hard work and dedication that they're putting behind this effort.

But to move forward, I wanted to comment on districts in and around Irvine and Orange County. Communities in Irvine and Costa Mesa face common challenges related to affordable housing, language access, and other concerns. The two cities that should be kept whole, drawn together with parts of Tustin and away from more affluent coastal communities like Newport Beach and Laguna Beach. I wanted to thank you for moving in the right direction with the 1102 visualizations. We wanted to identify a few remaining problems.

At the state assembly level, while Irvine is kept whole and together with Tustin, in district VADIRV 1102, Costa Mesa is divided from our Irvine, Costa Mesa, and Tustin communities of interest. We ask that you unite...
our COI by drawing Costa Mesa whole and into this
district with Irvine and Tustin. Costa Mesa is not part
of Little Saigon and has much more in common with these
communities, so please do not -- please do this without
dividing the (indiscernible) COI to the north, as well.

At the state senate level, our community of interest
is kept together, but drawn into a more affluent coastal
community of interest with which it is not aligned. We
understand that the Commission may be required to draw
VRA district in Orange County at the state senate level,
so any wholesale reworking of the area should draw these
three cities together and --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. PAVION: -- away from the coast.

At the congressional level, we also see that the --
while Irvine is kept whole and together with Tustin, our
communities of interest are divided between -- are being
divided by drawing Costa Mesa into an adjacent coastal
district.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. PAVION: Again, we ask that our COI be kept
together by drawing Costa Mesa into the same inland
district as Irvine and Tustin. Thank you so much and
thank you so much for the opportunity to participate.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now, we have caller 3100 and up next after that will be caller 3321.

Caller 3100, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

Caller 3100, you are unmuted. Can you hear me?

MS. ALVARADO: Hello. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. The floor is yours.

MS. ALVARADO: Thank you. Hi. My name is Karen Alvarado, and I represent Orange County Congregation Community Organization. And (Spanish words) are words to empower our leaders to bring (indiscernible) change in their community. So first of all, I want to recognize the Commission's work in this process and I really appreciate the opportunity to speak today.

I want to comment on Orange County district in and around Santa Ana. As you might know, Santa Ana is the home of the largest and most established Latinx community in Orange County. And similar communities of interest, including immigrants, low-income populations, and mixed status families. Drawn around this COI, we believe the -- they (indiscernible) obligation at every level centered around communities in Santa Ana, which includes the state senate district, which has not been drawn in your visualizations.
At the state assembly level, we do want to thank you for creating a majority Latinx district around Latinx communities of interest in Santa Ana. However, this district could be made more effective by removing parts of Orange and adding east Garden Grove.

At the state senate level, a majority Latinx district has not been drawn, despite racially polarized voting being found in existence in our districts that make a possible majority Latinx district. We ask the Commission to consider this position and draw a district around communities of interest with shared needs and concerns, including those in Santa Ana, in (indiscernible) Harbor, in Garden Grove --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ALVARADO: -- parts of Orange with Anaheim, south Fullerton, and other areas. At the congressional level, a majority Latinx district has been drawn, but divides communities, such as south Fullerton and west Anaheim. This majority Latinx district could be made more effective --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. ALVARADO: -- by adding south Fullerton and east -- south Fullerton and east Garden Grove, and removing Orange east of Santa Ana River and Santa Ana with (indiscernible). Across all levels, the maps
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have caller 3321 and up next after will be caller 3463.

Caller 3321, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. CHARCO: Hello. My name is Ana Charco, and I am here on behalf of Latino Health Access. Latino Health Access have been proudly working alongside our community residents for over twenty-seven years, providing services that address immediate health needs, while providing information, including opportunities to increase voter participation. And impact policies that will improve social welfare determinant in the long-term. I first want to thank you for your time, hard work and dedication, and taking our testimonies into consideration. I wanted to comment on Orange County district and in and around Santa Ana.

As you might know, Santa Ana is home to the largest and most established Latinx community in Orange County. The city includes similar of interest, including immigrants, low-income populations, and mixed status families. At the state assembly level, we thank you for creating a majority Latinx district around Latin communities of interest with Santa Ana. This district
could be more effective by removing parts of Orange and adding east Garden Grove.

At the state senate level, a majority Latinx district has not been drawn, despite racially polarized voting being found in existence in the districts that make up a possible majority Latinx district. We ask the Commission to reconsider this position and draw a district around communities of interest with similar concerns, including those of -- those in Santa Ana, east (indiscernible), east Garden Grove, parts of Orange, west Anaheim, south Fullerton, and other areas. This is, once again, for the state senate level.

At the congressional level, a majority Latinx district has been drawn, but it divides communities --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. CHARCO: -- of interest in south Fullerton and west Anaheim. This majority Latinx district would be even more effective by adding south Fullerton and east Garden Grove. Across all levels, please refer to the People's Redistricting Alliance did the best job of respecting these communities of interest --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. CHARCO: -- for Orange County, including ours.

Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now, we will have caller 3463 and up next after that will be caller 4120.

Caller 3463, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. RICCI: Hi. My name is Chris Ricci. I am a city council member representing District 3, in Modesto. In this case, my views are my personal opinions. I'm speaking of -- I'm just calling in to talk about Congressional District 10. I just want to emphasize that Modesto has a lot in common with cities like Tracy and Manteca. They're commuter towns with probably forty percent of their workers going to the Bay Area every day. And I've heard a lot of talk about maybe including other towns like Oakdale or Ripon in the district and I just think that that's -- just we have a lot in common with those communities.

The main goal is to try to keep these districts competitive, while kind of sharing geographic and common values. The experience of living in places like Modesto, or Manteca, or Tracy are very similar. They're larger towns of higher population, lots of commuters. Oakdale and Ripon kind of have, what, five stop lights combined, so it's just a very different experience. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now, we will have caller 4120 and up next after that will be caller 4628.

   Caller 4120, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

   MS. SAAVEDRA: Hello.

   PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

   MS. SAAVEDRA: Hi. My name is Lupe Saavedra, and I am a long-time resident of Santa Ana, in Orange County. And I am a presenter in Orange County. A community organization that help out those communities of color. And I'm also a member of the People's Redistricting Alliance. So first I want to thank you all for the work that you all have done. I appreciate it, although our community included (indiscernible). But I wanted to comment on Orange County district in and around Santa Ana.

   So Santa Ana is home to the largest and most established Latinx community in Orange County. The city includes immigrants, low-income population, and mixed status families. Drawn around this COI, we believe that there are very (indiscernible) at every level centered around our communities in Santa Ana. This includes the senate.

   A state senate district has not been drawn in your visualizations. At the state senate level, a majority
Latinx district has not been drawn, despite racially polarized voting being found in existence in our districts that make up a possible majority Latinx district. We ask the Commission to reconsider this position and draw such a district around communities of interest, with shared needs and concerns, including those in Santa Ana east of Harbor, east of Garden Grove, and part of Orange, west Anaheim, south Fullerton, and other areas.

At the state assembly level, we thank you for creating a majority Latinx district around aligned communities of interest in Santa Ana. This district could be made more effective by removing parts of Orange and adding some of east Garden Grove.

At the congressional level, a majority Latinx district has been drawn, but it divides communities of interest in south Fullerton and west Anaheim. This majority Latinx district could be made more effective by adding south Fullerton --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SAAVEDRA: -- and east Garden Grove, and removing Orange east of the Santa Ana River and Santa Ana west of Harbor.

Across all levels, the maps submitted by the People's Redistricting Alliance does a good job at
respecting those community boundaries and our community interests. So we would just encourage you all to consult those maps.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. SAAVEDRA: And thank you so much for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Just as a reminder --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

MR. MANOFF: I'm sorry to interrupt. As a reminder to those calling in to give comment tonight, all of your comments are being interpreted by our excellent ASL team, and are being live transcribed by live captioning to increase the accessibility to our live broadcast. Please speak at a moderate pace, and take your time with city and county names and numbers. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 4628. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Good evening. Do you hear me, right?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure do.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Good evening. First, I would like to thank you for all of your time and hard work. I understand that it's not easy for you. I were very disappointed that I wasn't able to speak during (indiscernible) yesterday. However, I thought I could
give it another try again today, hoping I can speak. Because when I saw the update map adding Costa Mesa, I was very upset. But I heard that the Commission is going to keep Little Saigon as a whole for the next map. Thank you for listening to the commands that our community has addressed. We need our voice heard in Sacramento and Washington. That's (indiscernible) our (indiscernible). Please keep Little Saigon community of interest together in one district for the congressional, state senate, and state assembly. Please keep Garden Grove, Westminster, Midway City, Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Seal Beach, Rossmoor, and Los Alamitos together. And I forgot to give you my name. My name is Kim Boy (ph.). I'm living in Westminster. Thank you for allowing me to speak. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Katy. We're up on a break, so we're going to take a break now and come back at 4:30 and continue with public comment. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Returning at 5 o'clock.

CHAIR LEMONS: Pardon me?

MR. MANOFF: Returning at 5 o'clock.

CHAIR LE MONS: Oh, I'm sorry, 5 o'clock. Yes, thank you. At 5 o'clock. It's been a long day.

MR. MANOFF: Very good, Chair. Thank you.
CHAIR LE MONS: See you back at 5.

MALE SPEAKER: We'll go backwards in time.

FEMALE SPEAKER: He has a time machine.

MR. MANOFF: All right. We are on break. Again, to those calling in, please stay connected and we will back to take your comments in fifteen minutes, at 5 o'clock.

(Off the record at 4:45 p.m.)

(On the record at 4:59 p.m.)

CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back, everyone, from your break. We're going to go back to public comment for the rest of the evening. We'll take another break at 6:30 for fifteen minutes and we do have a hard stop tonight at 7:30.

Katy?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. Right now, we will have caller 4656 and up next after that will be caller 4984.

Caller 4656, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

Caller 4656, you are unmuted.

MR. YODER: Hello, Mr. Chairman and other commissioners. My name is Paul Yoder, P-A-U-L Y-O-D-E-R. I am a state legislative advocate for San Joaquin County. I've addressed you before. With respect to assembly districts, the proposed visualizations for San Joaquin
County have the county carved up into three separate assembly districts. The county would like two assembly districts made up of eastern San Joaquin County and western San Joaquin County. The western San Joaquin County district would also include Stanislaus County. The Commission proposed this visualization during the week of October 26th, and requests you to reconsider that map.

For senate districts, San Joaquin County is currently represented by one senate district. The November 2nd visualizations propose to split it into two senate districts. Currently, the senate district allows the current senate district to allow San Joaquin County to be heard. By breaking the county up into two districts and aligning it with other counties, their unique voice will be diluted. In comments during the senate visualizations, a few commissioners noted that an interest in -- or noted an interest in keeping other counties whole. Why would you take a county that is currently whole and break it in two?

For the congressional district, San Joaquin County conducted significant public outreach over the past several months. Residents do not want to be represented by three congressional districts and want to have one congressional district. San Joaquin County has the
minimum population for this --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MR. YODER: -- and the communities of interest to have a congressional district that represents all of San Joaquin County, except for parts of Mountain House.

Thank you for your considerations.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 4984 and up next after that will be caller 5129.

 Caller 4984, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. And one more time. Caller 4984, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star 6. I do apologize, caller 4984, there appears to be some connectivity issues with you unmuting. I will make note and if I can, come back.

 At this time, we'll be going to caller 5129. Up next after that will be caller 5999.

 Caller 5129, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

 MS. WYNN: Hello. My name is Christina Wynn (ph.). I am a resident of Irvine and I am with the Orange County Asian and Pacific Islander Community Alliance. I understand that this Commission takes numerous factors and comments into consideration and I thank the hard work that this Commission has done to center our communities
of interest. I wanted to comment on districts in and around Irvine in Orange County. Communities in Irvine and Costa Mesa face shared challenges related to affordable housing, language access, and other concerns. These two cities should be kept whole, drawn together with parts of Tustin and away from more affluent coastal -- sorry -- coastal communities like Newport and Laguna Beach.

I want to thank you for moving in the right direction with those November 2nd visualizations, but wanted to identify a few remaining problems. At the state assembly level, why -- while Irvine is kept whole and together with Tustin in district VABIDR 1102, Costa Mesa is divided from our Irvine, Costa Mesa, and Tustin communities of interest. We ask that you unite our communities of interest by drawing Costa Mesa whole and include it in with this district with Irvine and Tustin. Costa Mesa is not part of Little Saigon and has much more in common with these communities. Please do this without dividing the (indiscernible) community of interest to the north, as well.

As to state senate level, our community of interest is kept together but drawn into a more affluent coastal community of interest, both of which is not aligned. We understand that the Commission may be
required to draw a (indiscernible) Orange County at the state senate level, so any large-scale reworking of the area should be drawn to the -- should draw these three cities together and separate from the coast.

At the congressional level, we also see that --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. WYNN: -- while Irvine is kept whole and together with Tustin, our communities of interest are divided by drawing Costa Mesa into an adjacent coastal district. Again, we ask that our communities of interest be kept whole by drawing Costa Mesa into the same inland district as Irvine and Tustin.

Across all levels, the maps submitted by the People's Redistricting Alliance --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. WYNN: -- does the best job in respecting these communities of interest throughout Orange County, including ours. We urge you to consult these maps for the best overall architecture for implementing these important changes. Thank you for all the work that you have done on behalf of our community, Commissioners.

MR. MANOFF: And as a reminder --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

MR. MANOFF: -- tonight for people calling in, your comments are being interpreted and live transcribed.
Please speak at a moderate pace and take your time with county names, city names, and numbers. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And now we have caller 5999 and up next after that will be caller 6275.

Caller 5999, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. JOHNSON: Great. Good afternoon. My name is Mary Johnson, M-A-R-Y J-O-H-N-S-O-N. And I'm a member of the Agua Dulce Town Council. Agua Dulce is a small, rural, unincorporated community in northern Los Angeles County. I reviewed the new assembly and state district boundaries and I'm frustrated to see that our community of Agua Dulce has been moved from the Santa Clarita valley area to the Antelope Valley area for both assembly and senate representations. Our community is linked more closely with the Santa Clarita valley and has very little in common with Kern County area and the Antelope Valley. The Santa Clarita valley area aligns with other agencies Agua Dulce has repre -- has for representation, and we share common social and economic interests with the Santa Clarita valley area.

I urge you to remove Agua Dulce from the Antelope
Valley area and place it back within the Santa Clarita valley area where we will be rep -- better represented -- better represented in both senate and assembly districts. Thank you for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we'll have caller 6275 and up next after that will be caller 6725.

Right now will be caller 6275. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours. Caller 6275, can you hear me? You are unmuted. You may want to make sure that your telephone is not on mute.

MS. NADAL: Can you hear me now?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. The floor is yours.

MS. NADAL: Oh, okay. Thank you. My -- my name is Linda Nadal, L-I-N-D-A N-A-D-A-L. And I'm a resident of Fallbrook, and -- which is a very rural unincorporated area of San Diego County. And I want to thank you for all the work you're doing and time spent on this. I'm sure it's a very daunting task. And I also appreciate that you have taken into consideration that Fallbrook should not be connected with Oceanside and I want to thank you for that. I really appreciate it.

And but I do see that you have not included
Fallbrook with Temecula. And I just want to encourage
you to add Temecula to that list, because we are
unincorporated, we don't have a hospital. And so all of
our hospital and needs would be going out to Temecula.
So all of my doctors are in Temecula, I do all my
shopping in Temecula. In fact, it's -- you know, as easy
to get to Temecula from the I-15 as it is go in town --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. NADAL: -- to Fallbrook. And so I'd really
appreciate you considering putting Temecula with the
Fallbrook, Bonsall, Pala --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. NADAL: Gee, I can't even remember all of them.
But the -- those unincorporated areas that are on the I-
15 down to Escondido. So thank you very much for
considering this and listening to our concerns. And --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we will have caller 6725 and up next after
that will be caller 8431.

Caller 6725, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. I appreciate
the opportunity to speak to you today. I just wanted to
commend you for your work so far. My name's Gina (ph.)
and I'm from Yucaipa. It's a small, quiet town tucked
into the San Bernardino mountains. I really want to show support for some of the current visualizations you have made so far. Our community definitely feels connected to the mountains and the desert towns drawn into the VCDBEABICVAL area.

So one thing I think that really makes sense with this map is that all of these towns are surrounded by land owned by the government. There's like national forest spaces and desert land, all owned by the government, and this map gives the communities affected by those lands a voice in how their treated. So I think it makes a lot of sense and I think you all are doing a very great job. So thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have caller 8431 and up next after that will be caller 8499.

Caller 8431, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. LARSON: Hi, there. My name is Taylor Larson (ph.). I'd like to make a public comment on communities of interest. More than half of Kings County lives in Hanford, Lemoor, and the surrounding communities, which are over an hour and a half away from Bakersfield, but only forty-five minutes from Fresno. Even though this area is long and covers a great distance, it makes sense,
as these communities are connected by I-5 and Highway 99. Residents regularly travel north or south for services, such as myself, for education, health care, and more. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 8499 and up next after that will be caller 8757.

Caller 8499, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commission. I think that Fresno and Kern County should be separated, because of one thing, valley fever. Valley fever is an infection of the respiratory system caused by a fungus that grows in the soil of the Central Valley. While treatment is available to most people, for those like me with a compromised immune system, it can be catastrophic. Valley fever has been an issue that has plagued residents of Kern County for generations. Unfortunately, Kern County has a per capita rate of valley fever that is over six times that of Fresno. Kern County needs residents who are focused on the severity of this issue. It is a matter of health equity to ensure that Kern and Fresno have separate representation. Thanks for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 8757 and up next after
that will be caller 6311.

   Caller 8757, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

   MS. GARCIA: Hello. Thank you. My name is Lucia Garcia (ph.) and I live in Yucaipa, in the San Bernardino County. I just wanted to call in and support the work on this -- on this city BEAVICVAL map. Our entire community has been stricken by wild fires and mud slides on the (indiscernible). And map connect us to the forest and those mountain communities, but also rural towns like mine. So this map is the most logical, and really appreciate your work on it. And I know this is a difficult task, but thank you for working so hard. I appreciate it.

   PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 6311, and up next after that will be Caller 7693.

   Caller 6311, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

   MS. COLE: Hi, thank you. My name is Robin Cole, and I'm calling from Tracy. First of all, I would like to thank the commissioners for what -- the work they have done. The changes they've made to our congressional district in Tracy that we asked for are fabulous. You include Tracy with Manteca, Lathrop, Mountain House, and
I am a citizen of Tracy. My husband and I raised both our children here. We -- from preschool all the way through high school. I am not a paid consultant. I want my community to be my community.

So first of all, the draw -- new drawings look great on 11/02. I'd ask you that leave them that way so that Tracy, Mountain House, Manteca remain in the Central Valley region. I'd also request that the Assembly district include Lathrop and Manteca, which is currently carved out, and the senate district -- bring Mountain House, Tracy together with Lathrop and Manteca as well.

We have successfully blended the sub -- with those communities to bring a suburb, rural, and agricultural community blend together that really works with us for our common goals and concerns. These are specific to transportation, water, our shared valley culture, economic growth, and that will help to keep our young adults to be able to live and work, build their own families in the communities in which they were raised.

MALE SPEAKER: Thirty seconds.

MS. COLE: This helps to build strong family ties. The progress we've made in these areas will be severely and negatively impacted by separating us out at this point in time. So please leave Tracy, Mountain House,
Manteca --

MALE SPEAKER: Fifteen.

MS. COLE: -- and Lathrop with Modesto in the Valley region. We have much more in common as valley people than we do with other counties. Thank you very much for your time and your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we have Caller 7693, and up next after that will be Caller 6836.

Caller 7693, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MS. ROE: Hello, this is Christine Roe (ph.), and I'm calling you about the congressional district. I'm looking at pages 42, 43, and 45. First of all, I would like to say that there's no labels for -- by neighborhood councils or anything for the City of Los Angeles or the communities on these maps.

The San Fernando Valley does not belong in DCD (ph.), Malibu, San Fernando Valley. What you -- one of your line drawers today made a very, very valid point about Sunland-Tujunga being a rural community that's going all the way down in DCD, Glendale, all the way down to practically Beverly Hills.

So what would be better is to take Malibu, San Fernando Valley, and put that with your lower -- your
mountainous areas down below the Mulholland Drive. Put that together, your Malibu area, and then put the San Fernando Valley whole -- take Sunland-Tujunga and put it with DCD, SFD, and put the San Fernando Valley whole above Mulholland Drive to an -- to be completely inclusive and no longer call it Malibu SFD. Call it SFD. And you know, I've lived in this community for forty-five years. I've worked with --

MALE SPEAKER: Thirty seconds.

MS. ROE: -- the (indiscernible) council. There are thirty-four neighborhood councils that represent the San Fernando Valley, and that includes all the way from Sunland-Tujunga and Granada Hills and everything to the north --

MALE SPEAKER: Fifteen seconds.

MS. ROE: -- and West Hills on the far west. And so I'm very, very familiar with the San Fernando Valley but also familiar with the adjacent communities of Calabasas, which is just about three miles from my home. But Calaba --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 6836, and up next after that will be Caller 8978.

Caller 6836, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.
MALE SPEAKER: Hello. I live in Kern, and we have a lot of energy and agricultural needs that are specific to our county. The current visualization (indiscernible) us and (indiscernible) to help both out. (Indiscernible) effective. I ask the Commission to please reconsider this decision given our cultural differences. Bye-bye. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have Caller 8978, and up next after that will be Caller 3187.

Caller 8978, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a resident of Fresno, California. First off, I do want to thank you all for your continued work on these maps.

I would like to again voice some concerns over splitting the city of Fresno into three congressional districts. Cutting the city of Fresno so many times really, really dilutes the Latino vote and I do believe will harm our community. I encourage the Commission to draw two seats in the city of Fresno with one hoping that it -- that it's over fifty percent Latino.

Again, I thank you guys for your hard work and for listening to our concerns.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have Caller 3187, and up next after
that will be Caller 9691.

Caller 3187, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. I would like to thank the
Commission on your continued work on the map.

I want to voice my concerns about splitting the city
of Fresno into three. If the city is split in too many
ways, it dilutes the Latino vote. As part of the Latino
community myself, I ask that you consider only two seats
in the Fresno area with one being over fifty percent
Latino. This is to ensure Latinos can elect a candidate
of their choice.

I hope you will take our concerns about Fresno into
consideration, and once again, thank you for hearing us
out.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now, we will have Caller 9691, and up next after that
will be Caller 8128.

Caller 9691, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. My name is Christian
(ph.) from the city of Fresno. First, I want to thank
the Commission for your continued work on these maps. I
know you all have really difficult jobs.
I called last night to voice my concern with the proposed congressional maps that split Fresno into thirds, and I wanted to call back again to reemphasize my concern to the Commission. I'm a Latino native of south Fresno, you know, which is really the heart of Fresno's Latino community. I believe our community would be best represented by drawing a Voting Rights Act district that keeps the heart of Fresno's Latino community unified to include all of the City of Fresno that's south of Shaw Avenue and west of the 99.

I want to echo Commissioner Sinay's comments from earlier this morning that I think very well stressed how splicing the city of Fresno as the current visualizations do would really disenfranchise our community by diluting our vote. Rather, I believe the Commission should draw two congressional seats in Fresno with one that's a Voting Rights Act district -- excuse me -- that is majority Latino.

You know, I also think this proposal would really allow the Commission to draw three VRA district seats across the Central Valley, which would really allow us to maximize our representation in Congress. You know, to this end, I'd really like to echo Commissioner Fernandez's comments from earlier in the day that the Commission ought to continue its work to make the Merced-
Fresno seat majority Latino as well.

So thank you again for your tireless work on drawing --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MALE SPEAKER: -- equitable congressional maps that maximize Latino representation in Congress for the central valley and for Fresno specifically. I really hope you'll take my concerns into consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 8128, and up next after that will be Caller 7070.

Caller 8128, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute? And the floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Hi. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Oh, hi. Hi, commissioner. I was calling to ask your Commission would take public comments and make sure we keep the community of (indiscernible) together. So went online to submit my comment and tried calling in to make sure our voice is heard. I wasn't able to speak yesterday even though I work (indiscernible) more than two hours, so I really appreciate your comment, allowing me to speak today. Thank you very much again.

I heard the commissioners yesterday talk about
making sure our beloved Little Saigon community is kept whole. Thank you so much for listening to us. As a reminder, Little Saigon includes Huntington Beach, Garden Grove, Fountain Valley (indiscernible) and Westminster. We deserve our voice to be heard collectively and hope to continue to develop for the betterment of our children.

Thank you very much, and have a good evening. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. All right. Now we will have Caller 7070, and up next after that will be Caller 0080.

 Caller 7070, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MR. IRVING: Hello. My name is Jim Irving, I-R-V-I-N-G. I'm a realtor and a native of Paso Robles and a former county planning commissioner, I appreciate the Commission's tireless and -- work on this and your endless patience.

I am calling with regard to the proposed assembly district which splits our county into two. We have always been in the past a unified county, and it makes no sense to divide our county and stretch it all the way forward to -- or all the way north to Capitola. We have very little in common with the Monterey Bay area.

Conversely, going south, the proposed district takes
the southern part of our county and stretches it into Santa Barbara. Again, not a unified and similar area.

I would prefer to see the district redrawn to perhaps run from San Ardo in Monterey County, which is an oil-producing area and cattle and wine grapes and -- which is exactly what takes place in San Luis County with oil, cattle, and wine grapes, and extend further south into northern Santa Barbara County to include the area around Santa Maria, going southward --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. IRVING: -- to Lompoc and further down to Los Alamos. Also all similar areas, and it would be much more unified --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. IRVING: -- and it'd be much better for us.

Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 0080, and up next after that will be Caller 1535.

Caller 0080, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MR. PURDIE: Good evening. My name is Rob Purdie, R-O-B, P as in Paul, U-R, D as in David, I-E. I'm calling regarding VCD Madera-Kern 1102 which links Kern and Fresno Counties together. I'd like to thank the
members for all their hard work and also thank
Commissioner Toledo for bringing his experience in health
care to this commission since my topic is health equity.

I'm a Valley fever patient and patient advocate in
Bakersfield, California. Valley fever's caused by a
fungal spore that exists in parts of southwestern United
States and is hyperendemic in Kern County. I'm a patient
living with the most severe form of the disease, and I
currently interact with hundreds of other patients.

And linking Kern County to Fresno County would more
than just dilute our voice when it comes to Valley fever;
it would actually completely extinguish it. The
current -- the 2019 case rate of Valley fever in
California was 22.5 per 100,000 residents. In Fresno,
that rate is forty, I believe. No. Excuse me, sixty,
which is quite a bit higher. But Kern County's rate per
100,000 residents is 367. So Valley fever greatly
impacts Kern County.

And we have been able to create a voice by working
with our representatives in Kern County, a united voice
for this endemic area that will be extinguished by
dividing this area and linking it to Fresno County. And
I think that will be to the detriment of not only Kern
County and Fresno County but the entire state.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
MR. PURDIE: So I just wanted to thank you guys again for your time and for giving me the opportunity to speak. That's it.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll have Caller 1535, and up next after that will be Caller 8224.

Caller 1535, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Again, thank you so much for taking all these calls. I'm sure you're having a long several days.

My name Carrie Hernandez (ph.). I'm from Fresno City. I've been listening to everyone speak, especially, obviously, the Fresno City individuals. And I would have to say I'm agreeing and I will echo with what a lot of the prior citizens have said before me about probably -- I think we need three Voting Rights districts.

My main concern is the Hispanic population. I've lived here. I've had my children in school here. We've traveled. I've been a part of a lot of Fresno Unified schools and seen the communities. And I think it's very important that the Hispanic community can be kind of collated and kept together just so it can give us representation that's unique to our issues, the minority issues, to the poverty levels that we see.
I think when you break us up, we just get thrown by the wayside, and I think we can all agree that we really need to help these impoverished regions, and especially when education's such a big issue. So when you consider mapping, I implore you again to please consider keeping our --

MAR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. HERNANDEZ: -- Hispanic population together, which is really on south -- south Fresno side. So thank you so much, and -- thanks again. Good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 8224, and up next after that will be Caller 1535.

Caller 8224, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello? Do you hear me now?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we do. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we do. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Hi, my name's Stephanie (ph.). I have called and (indiscernible) today, letting you know that I was not happy to hear that you want to divide Little Saigon into different districts. You have failed
to see that Little Saigon (indiscernible) hospitals
(indiscernible) restaurants, you name it, are brought
over in the (indiscernible) of Midway City
(indiscernible) Huntington Beach (indiscernible)
Westminster and Garden Grove.

Westminster High School and Fountain Valley High
School are with Huntington Beach Union High School
District. Fountain Valley School District has school in
Huntington Beach. Garden Grove United -- Garden Grove
School District have school in Fountain Valley and
Westminster (indiscernible) share the same school
district with (indiscernible) School District, where a
lot of children who live in Garden Grove go to as well.

As you can see, our children attending school
(indiscernible) in the area, and the education is unique
(indiscernible) for the (indiscernible) community
(indiscernible) available at all of these school
districts for our parents who just go with speaking and
understand English.

It's important that you keep Little Saigon whole by
making sure our education and culture, community of
interest is kept together. (Indiscernible) Westminster,
Garden Grove (indiscernible) Huntington Beach
(indiscernible) stay together. Thank you for your time,
and hopefully you have made sure to not rip our community
apart.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you again.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have Caller 1535, and up next after that will be Caller 7333.

Caller 1535, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MR. MALDONADO: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Tony Maldonado (ph.). I'm Latino, male, and a twenty-three-year-old resident of Santa Clarita. I'm vehemently opposed to the dramatic changes to the visualization maps for Santa Clarita that removes Simi Valley, Antelope Valley, and parts of the greater Santa Clarita Valley and instead includes the San Fernando Valley.

I strongly support the map as submitted by the City of Santa Clarita. In short, we have nothing in common with the San Fernando Valley and everything with Simi Valley, Agua Dulce, and the Antelope Valley, and if your maps were upheld, it would largely disenfranchise our community.

The greater Santa Clarita Valley, like Simi Valley, is an affluent exurban community geographically separated from the highly dense urban sprawl of the San Fernando Valley.
Valley area of the City of Los Angeles by a large
mountain range with a very narrow passage in between that
during certain natural events has been physically closed.
In 1987, Santa Clarita seceded from the City of Los
Angeles because they had nothing in common with the City
of Los Angeles, which treated the area as its personal
landfill.

Now, the removal of Simi Valley, Antelope Valley,
and parts of the greater Santa Clarita Valley from our
maps and the proposed merger of the San Fernando Valley
would once again put the City of Santa Clarita and the
surrounding neighborhoods at a large disadvantage as the
City of Los Angeles will once again impose its will, much
to the detriment of the residents of Santa Clarita, who
have worked tirelessly to make it a fantastic place to
live and work for everyone: Latino, black, Asian, white,
LGBTQ, and everyone under the sun, regardless of
political --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MALDONADO: -- affiliation. I propose and
hopefully hope that you will actually amend your --
amend -- amend your maps so that they actually match our
maps as we submitted. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now we will have Caller 7333, and up next after that will
be Caller 2688. No, I apologize. Caller 2668.

Right now will be Caller 7333. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MR. NETH: Thank you. Good evening, commissioners. My name is Monorom Neth. I'm the first vice chair of Cambodia Town in beautiful Long Beach City, and more importantly, I am part of the Cambodian community in Long Beach.

Long Beach has the largest Cambodian population outside of Cambodia, and earlier this week, we saw the Commission release two maps that kept Long Beach together but the congressional map that proposed to split Long Beach apart. I would like to request that Cambodian community and Long Beach can be kept together. And as you move forward with this process, I know you have a lot to consider and not enough time, but please consider keeping the Cambodian community and Long Beach together.

And I want to thank the commissioner who gave direction to bring Long Beach back together. Today was definitely the direction we want to see. Again, please keep Long Beach and the Cambodian community together.

Thank you for hearing my comments on this matter. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have Caller 2668, and up next after
that will be Caller 5592.

Caller 2668, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six? The floor
is yours. Caller 2668, you are unmuted. Can you hear
me? You may want to double-check and make sure your
telephone is not on mute.

MALE SPEAKER: Oh. Hello? Can you hear me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. The floor
is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Well, first off, thank you for taking
the time to hear my comment and for all the hard work
you're doing to provide fair and equitable districts for
us -- us here in Central Valley. As an active member of
the Central Valley community, I've been watching the
process thoroughly, and I'd specifically like to thank
Commissioner Fornaciari for his acknowledgement of our
concerns over the Kern-Madera district, which ties the --
Kern and Fresno together.

Later today, I believe Commissioner Yee mentioned
that the public comments from members of the Long Beach
community was a united call, and I just hope that the
Commission's -- acknowledges that our concerns in the
Central Valley are a united call as well. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have Caller 5592, and up next after that
will be Caller 7698.

Caller 5592, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Well, good afternoon,
commissioners. Thank you for your continued efforts on
these maps and the opportunity to speak.

I'd like to express concern that some of my fellow
neighbors have mentioned as well before me over splitting
the City of Fresno across three districts. I believe
there should be a Voting Rights Act congressional
district anchored in the City of Fresno that encompasses
everything south of Shaw Avenue and west of Highway 99 to
make sure the Latino communities of Fresno are included
in one district.

As Commissioner Sinay noted this morning, cutting
the City of Fresno three times reduces the Latino vote
and I believe marginalizes our Latino community. I
advocate for the Commission to draw two seats in the City
of Fresno with one as a VRA district, thus affording you
the ability to create three VRA seats here in the Central
Valley, which would promote a strong Latino community
voice.

Further, Commissioner Fernandez expressed the need
to push Latino (indiscernible) over fifty percent on the
Merced-Fresno seat to further reflect VRA concerns. I have to say I agree with her and encourage the Commission to push the seat over fifty percent.

Thank you again for your work, and I hope you will take our concerns about the City of Fresno into consideration. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 7698, and up next after that will be Caller 2881.

Caller 7698, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi. I wanted to thank all you guys for all the time that you have spent putting these maps together.

My area of concern is about splitting up the City of Fresno and further disenfranchising our Latinx brothers and sisters. I believe there should be a Voting Rights Act congressional district anchored in the City of Fresno. This should include everything south of Shaw Avenue and west of Highway 99 to make sure that the Latinx community members of Fresno are included in one district and their electoral and political power is not further diluted. I believe, like -- you know, like I said, the Commission should draw two seats in the City of Fresno with at least one of them being a majority Latinx.
So again, thank you guys for the work that you are doing. Done. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 2881, and up next after that will be Caller 5820.

Caller 2881, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MR. WHITING: Hi. My name is Edward Whiting, and I am currently an elected official with the City of Taft as a city council member and have been so for the last three years. Prior to that, I had a lifetime of law enforcement with the City of Taft and the county of Kern, almost forty years' worth. And I'd just like to thank the Commission for their time. I know that they have a very tough job.

I'm familiar with Fresno, which is two hours to our north, but spent most of my life here in almost all parts of Kern County. I can tell you Fresno and Kern Counties geographically and culturally share very little. Kern County is much more diverse.

We have oil to the west, agriculture in the southern San Joaquin Valley, mountains to the east, and further east is the upper desert. We have the largest oil reserves. Our large agricultural area helps feed this great nation and the world. Our mountains host fishing,
hiking, boating, and so much more. The upper desert to
the east produces one million tons of refined borates
every year, which is approximately thirty percent of the
global demand. It also hosts Edwards Air Force Base
dedicated to the -- aerospace testing, and at Ridgecrest,
there's a naval weapons test center.

As you heard from the previous callers, this
proposed change could drastically affect water
allocations, transportation grants, and roads projects.
I firmly believe the senate and congressional districts
should remain as is and not be aligned with Fresno,
which -- where we share very little.

MALE SPEAKER: Thirty seconds.

MR. WHITING: And thank you, commissioners, for your
time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have Caller 5820, and up next after
that will be Caller 8087.

Caller 5820, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, hi. I reside in Fresno,
California. I called before in the past. I first want
to thank you for your guys' work on this map and your
long hours. We really appreciate it.

As the Commission does try to finalize these draft
maps, I did want to voice concerns as well as my
community has been tonight about splitting the City of
Fresno three times and how that really disenfranchises
our Hispanic community here. I know we have been calling
about this for weeks, and I will -- I will say there
should be a Voting Rights Act congressional district that
is anchored in the City of Fresno, not just going to have
part of it but is really anchored in the City of Fresno,
meaning, you know, south of Shaw Avenue and west of
Highway 99 all together to really make sure that our
Latino community in Fresno are included in one district
so they can elect a representative of their choice.

Cutting the City of Fresno three times really
dilutes the Latino vote and other people of color and
disenfranchises our community. You know, I think
Commissioner Sinay did note this this morning in her
comments. So we really ask that the Commission draw two
seats in the City of Fresno with one being a VRA district
in -- south of Shaw and west of 99.

Splitting the City of Fresno twice will give you the
ability to create three VRA seats across the Central
Valley, which I know the Commission did discuss today.
They did discuss wanting a third one, and this is a great
way to do it. It would go a long way to make sure that
our Latino community in the Central Valley isn't
disenfranchised. And I know Commissioner Fernandez also mentioned there is more work needed on the Merced-Fresno seats. And so we do --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MALE SPEAKER: -- ask that you (indiscernible) the -- the Latino seat back over fifty percent, and we do agree with that.

So we thank you for your work. You guys have been incredibly receptive to other public comment across the state, and we just ask that you hear this comment from the Central Valley and please be responsive --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MALE SPEAKER: -- to it. We appreciate seeing the new maps next week. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 8087, and up next after that will be Caller 8184.

Caller 8087, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MS. LOREN: My name is Jesse Loren. I live on the west side of Winters towards Lake Berryessa. I'm a retired teacher. I serve on Winters' city council, and I'm liaison representative to Winters' Hispanic Advisory Committee.

It is important to us to have senate, congressional,
and assembly districts be similar in structure and communities of interest. I thank you and ask that you continue to keep Yolo whole and visualize Yolo and Solano County together as an anchor when drawing our district lines.

I want to thank you for keeping Yolo together with the Delta community and Solano and Contra Costa County. Lake Berryessa and the mountain range is a shared ecotourist area for our county. When the Monticello Dam was built in the '50s, it critically impacted the surrounding tributaries, including, but not limited to, Putah Creek. Putah Creek is riparian. It's also home to spawning Chinook salmon, which then move north to the Delta, Sacramento, and out to sea.

I wanted to point out that management decisions relate Berryessa concessionaires and marinas and whether or not the lake is open for recreation all have great economic impact on Road 128 businesses that are the gateway to Berryessa but also impact Napa, Solano, and Yolo.

From an education lens, Solano K12 --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. LOREN: -- students from greater (audio interference) attend school in -- in Winters Joint Unified School District, and Winters students are part of
the Solano Community College district. Overall, education, employment, land, fire, health, nature, and water management --

MALE SPEAKER: Fifteen seconds.

MS. LOREN: -- all binds us as communities of interest. It is our regional interest to keep us together. Thank you so much for your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 8184, and up next after that will be Caller 6058.

Caller 8184, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? And one more time, Caller 8184, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute? And the floor is yours.

MS. RAMOS: Good evening, Commission. My name is Belia Ramos, B-E-L-I-A R-A-M-O-S, and I am a Napa County supervisor. I wanted -- I will start with tagging onto the comments of the prior caller and specifically draw the Commission's attention to the assembly district map that is drawn in regards to Yolo but does not currently include Napa County.

One of the very unique parts that the caller just mentioned before is the Berryessa Snow Mountain Monument area and the fact that the relationship between Yolo County and Napa County is so incredibly strong.
Berryessa, Lake Berryessa, and the concessionaires are fully contained within Napa County but have a direct correlation and impact with Yolo County.

Additionally, Napa County and Yolo County share many agricultural interests, and in fact, a very unique one is the olive oil industry. I would implore the Commission to consider redrawing the map of the assembly district so that Yolo is contained wholly within one assembly district but it also contains that unique relationship that Yolo County has with Napa County through the Berryessa Snow Mountain.

Yesterday afternoon, I did (audio interference) in regards to the congressional district, we are incredibly appreciative that Napa County has continued --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. RAMOS: -- to remain whole within these maps.

And I am appreciative of the comments made by Commissioners Toledo and Fernandez that Marin County has nothing in common with Napa County. Napa County, Lake County, Sonoma County, we share agricultural and agrarian interests. We share fire --

MALE SPEAKER: Ten seconds.

MS. RAMOS: -- prevention and recovery interests, and we do not have anything in common with the coastal county of Marin, and I would ask that you remove Marin
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 6058, and up next after that will be Caller 6832.

Caller 6058, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello? Yes. My name's Shiruni (ph.), and I'm calling about northwest Orange County area. I'm extremely concerned about the suggestion of commissioners to move the bordering cities of Orange County into L.A. County to keep Long Beach intact. The seat of Long Beach is in L.A. County, and if Long Beach is to split, the districts are still in L.A. County, still within the community of interest with appropriate representation, whereas if you take the bordering cities of Orange County into L.A. County, we are talking about a completely different community of interest, completely different values, and we will lose any representation, and our voices will be silenced.

We, the bordering cities of Orange County, need Orange County representation that understand our needs and concerns so that our voices can be heard. Any bordering city that joins Long Beach will be disenfranchised. One of the goals of redistricting is to keep a cohesive community with community interests. But
L.A. County and Orange County are like night and day, and we have nothing in common. There was a suggestion to include Seal Beach and parts of Huntington Beach into Long Beach. Well, you are moving the right direction by moving Cypress, Los Alamitos, and Rossmoor into Orange County, and we really appreciate for that, and that -- we will -- so we would like the commissioners to have the same concern to keep Long Beach intact as to keep Orange County cities intact with Orange County boundaries. Why break up a county that is whole and break up into two?

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Splitting our bordering cities into Long Beach and LA County will be detrimental to those cities. Please reconsider your redistricting, and I implore you to keep Orange County cities --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: -- within Orange County boundaries. Thank you for your time and education through this process.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 6832, and up next after that will be Caller 2567.

Caller 6832, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.
MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. First, I want to thank the Commission for hearing me and taking my concern under consideration. I'm from Fresno, and my county is in the Central Valley. I'm concerned that if Fresno and Kern are in the same congressional district, my representative will cater to the agricultural and energy needs of Kern rather than what my community needs. I ask the Commission to seriously reconsider its decision to include Kern and Fresno in the same district. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 2567, and up next after that will be Caller 8279.

Caller 2567, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi, commissioners. My name is Robert. Thank you for your continued work on these maps. As the Commission tries to finalize drafting maps, I want to voice concerns about splitting the City of Fresno three times.

Cutting the City of Fresno so many times dilutes the Latino vote and harms our community. The Commission should draw two seats in the City of Fresno with one that is over fifty percent Latino. This makes sure Latinos can elect a candidate of their choice.

Thank you for your work, and I hope that you will
take our concerns about the City of Fresno into consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 8279, and up next after that will be Caller 5699.

Caller 8279, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you so much, commissioners, for taking my call, and thank you for all your hard work and for listening to the public and putting, you know, Tracy and Mountain Home back in a community.

Merced wants to be kept whole. This is very important to Merced. I hear so many people talking about the Voting Rights Act. You know, I'm a fifth generation here in Merced. I have a family member that raised me that actually marched with Dr. King in Selma for the right to vote. And so splitting up Merced and giving us two congressmen, congressional districts, will take away and dilute not just the Hispanic vote by the African American vote.

UC Merced, Merced Community College are important institutions in the community with Merced College having two campuses, one in Merced and one in Los Banos. We should not split our community.
And again, historically, Merced County is a Voting Rights Act, VRA, district that is majority Latino, but it was also African -- African American. And the Commission should continue to be in compliance with the VRA as Latinos and African Americans and black people continue to be underrepresented. The current proposal helps to ensure our -- that our water, our culture, our agriculture, our economic, family, religious --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: -- and social ties stay intact. So again, please do not split Merced up. Keep us, again, as a whole. And thank you so much for taking the time and listening to us here in Merced.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have Caller 5699, and up next after that will be Caller 3770.

Caller 5699, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MR. MUNSON: Thank you very much. I just want to confirm you can hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. MUNSON: Thanks a lot. My name is John Munson (ph.), representing Nature for All. I should mention that I have lived in Duarte, Pasadena, La Canada, Glendale, and Tujunga most of my life. I've been
conservation and equity organizing for twenty years in
and around the San Gabriel Mountains.

We generally like AVSCV, FSV, GLEN2B, and CDWSGV,
and we think them responsive to our recommendations. We
have a variety of concerns about how the lines are drawn
for dis -- congressional districts that include the San
Gabriel Mountains and adjacent communities. One of our
goals is to make sure that all of the foothill
communities of interest (indiscernible) Rancho Cucamonga
are located in the congressional district that includes
the national forest to the north, and we thank for -- the
Commission for keeping this in mind.

Note that I said districts, though. The scope of
the foothills COI is unusual in its length and its -- the
number of people in it. It appears in segments in
today's 27th, 28th, and 29th districts, and we believe
each of these segments qualifies a community of interest
in themselves. All -- we want to see all the foothills
cities and districts that include the national forest.
We do not want to see districts only composed of
foothills cities. We have always recommended that these
districts run from south -- run further south as you --
as your visualizations in the districts I mentioned
currently do.

From a public lands perspective, you do not want
only affluent people having a say in how forests are managed.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MUNSON: Park -- people (indiscernible) communities need to be in the mix as much as La Canada (indiscernible). We really like the (indiscernible) community in the south (indiscernible) San Gabriel Valley visualization CDWSGV --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. MUNSON: -- and I thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 3770, and up next after that will be Caller 5325.

Caller 3770, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MR. GARRETT-PATE: Thank you. Good evening, commissioners. My name is Sam Garrett-Pate. I'm calling on behalf of Equality California about two LA area congressional visualizations, starting with LB North.

We want to thank the Commission for their attention to Long Beach today. Specifically, we want to thank Commissioners Turner, Sadhwani, and Toledo for their instruction to unite most of Long Beach, including the historic LGBTQ-Plus community with Seal Beach and Huntington Beach, which have similar LGBTQ-Plus
communities of interest. Doing so would be consistent with the VRA. It would allow for two black opportunity districts to the northwest in LA County. It would allow for an effective Asian Opportunity district around Little Saigon, and it would unite the LGBTQ-Plus communities in the area.

Next, regarding visualization GLEN2BA, we want to thank Commissioner Akutagawa for her instructions to add in North Hollywood and Studio City today, both of which have significant LGBTQ-Plus communities of interest. This change will help to further unite our LA LGBTQ-Plus community and empower us to elect candidates of choice.

I want to thank you again. We greatly appreciate this commission's commitment toempowering LGBTQ-Plus Californians through redistricting, and I hope you have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we have Caller 5325, and up next after that will be Caller 1781.

Caller 5325, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MS. HURLEY: Hello. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. HURLEY: Okay, great. My name is Corinthia Hurley, and I'm a longtime resident of Merced,
California. And I am calling in -- in regard to the idea of splitting Merced County into two districts.

I would like to say that I've come to notice some things throughout these calls and the persons who have spoken. What I will say is I applaud the Commission for all the hard work that they've done and giving this -- I know this was no easy feat. But I would like to point out that I know we often pay attention to the statistical data and the numbers and population and different things like that. But I think one thing that I've noticed is that the part that may have been left out that's just important for us to note is the people and the lives that will be affected by the decisions that we're making with dealing with the redistricting.

So what I will say is just, like, Merced County is a small county. So to split us into two would cause irreparable damage and all the progress that we have made as a community. Also, my concern is the community that -- in the foothills is -- it looks vastly different to Merced County, not even just geographically, but as far as political views and just the different things that we have as priorities here. And so I feel to split Merced into two districts would do a complete disservice to the community here and the persons who are here.

I think we have to look at keeping Merced whole and
in one district and --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. HURLEY: -- to keep us with Fresno because we have been able to do a lot of work that way.

But I really would just urge the Commission to think about the persons whose lives are going to change based off the decisions that are made here and to really take into account what has been said and to make some changes. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we have Caller 1781, and up next after that will be Caller 1539.

Caller 1781, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six?

MS. VAZQUEZ: Hello, can you --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MS. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. This is -- thank you very much. This is Lucia Vazquez. I reside in Visalia, California, which is in the Central Valley. As a matter of fact, I live real close to what they call the Oval District, which is a very high poverty area, one of the most -- the highest poverty areas in the Central Valley.

And I'm calling today to again thank you for your work. I know this is difficult, to try to please everybody. But I would like to urge you today and remind
you that we need four Latino VRA assembly seats in the Valley. We need two Latino VRA senate seats and three Latino VRA congressional seats, and fifty percent is -- is not a strong VRA district. We really need them to be a little stronger than that.

Please take in consideration the black and AAPI communities, to include them in the Latino VRA districts. We have so much in common.

And please do not split small towns. You know, it -- somebody -- it -- the cuts have to go somewhere. We understand that. You know, the counties need to be cut up, but not the small towns. They have so little representation. It's so hard to be able to work together with a small town to be able to get somewhere and really get that effective leadership, and once you split that, it really does a disservice to them.

So again, thank you so much for the time and the countless hours that you have put in, and thank you for your representation.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. VAZQUEZ: We need effective leadership. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 1539, and up next after that will be Caller 7604.
Caller 1539, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MS. COOK: My name is Leigh Ann Cook, trustee for the Rosedale Union School District in Bakersfield, California, and for the County of Kern. Thank you, commissioners, and your staff -- I especially know how difficult this is on all of you -- for hearing my comment and for the important work you are doing during this public process.

Today I wanted to express my concerns and thoughts on the Madera-Kern map within the 23rd congressional district that represents Kern County. It is of the utmost importance that we have strong representation in Washington, D.C., to help us address our educational challenges. As one of the fastest-growing minority communities in the state, we need to be sure our voices are heard for the resources that we desperately need.

We do not want radical changes to our representation. We want to keep our communities together, not linked with places as far away as Fresno. I ask that something closer to our existing lines remains to continue leadership that can address our unique challenges.

It is also important to note the work Kern County is doing to diversity its economy from our traditional
industries. This involves eastern Kern County and aerospace and having our communities of Ridgecrest, China Lake, areas surrounding Edwards Air Force Base, and the Antelope Valley connected and that effort to attract projects like Space -- the SpaceX program and the emerging industries that go with it.

Lastly, the historical boundaries of the 23rd district have gone no farther north of Tulare County, have gone as far south as Lancaster, Palmdale, and as far west as San Luis Obispo --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. COOK: -- County, which shares production of oil and agriculture and ranching dating back to Congressman Bill Ketchum.

Again, thank you for your time and hearing my thoughts and concerns. I hope that you have a good evening. And --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. COOK: -- on a lighter note, we cannot have Fresno and Bakersfield together as they are Giants fans and we are Dodgers. Have a good evening. Thank you.

Good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 7604, and up next after that will be Caller 0458.
Caller 7604, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? One more time, Caller 7604, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? Caller 7604, I do apologize. There appears to be a connectivity issue. If we can, we will try to come back.

At this time, we'll be going to Caller 0458, and up next after that will be Caller 2087.

Caller 0458, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. I also would like to offer my thanks and appreciation to the Commission for all of the work that you are doing on this monumental task. My name is Fiona. That is spelled F as in Frank, I-O-N-A, and I live in Diamond Bar. And I specifically want to speak about our congressional district, which was on page 50 of the document you were discussing today, and I would like to thank the commissioner, whose name I've forgotten now, who brought up the same points that I'm going to bring up.

I'd like to thank you for keeping Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, Walnut, and Hacienda Heights together in a district. These are communities that I feel as a resident have many similar interests. As a resident of Diamond Bar for more than ten years who has moved around...
these communities doing the things I do in my normal
life, I don't feel like they -- these contiguous
communities have anything in common with the other
communities that have been added to this district,
specifically those cities along the 605 corridor.
The 60 corridor and the 57 corridor have a lot more
in common. I believe that -- I mean, there's a joke that
Diamond Bar's actually north north Orange County. We
have a little bit more in common with Brea and Fullerton
to the point where students -- high school students in
Fullerton and Brea who don't want to see each other at
Fullerton Community College --
MAR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
FEMALE SPEAKER: -- actually go to Mt. SAC and
Mount -- and students in the Walnut, Diamond Bar area
will go down to Fullerton Community College for something
different, I suppose. So I think that the consideration
of adding northern Orange County into the Rowland
Heights, Diamond Bar, Hacienda Heights, Walnut
congressional document --
MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.
FEMALE SPEAKER: -- possibly even pulling in Cal
Poly Pomona -- I know that's hard. But Cal Poly and Mt.
SAC work together a lot. And even extending up the --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have Caller 8556, and up next after
that will be Caller 6456.

Caller 8556, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six? The floor
is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you so much, all the
Commission. And my name is Ronby (ph.). I'm from Long
Beach. I work for the community service interfaith and
also mental health services as well.

When people start to talk about unity, they feel
happy. Because in Long Beach City, it's beautiful city,
we bring together with different culture, economic, and
religion. So it's something we talk about -- or hear
about the splitting, which is very sad, and people not
happy at all.

And especially in Cambodia Town, we go through -- we
gone through three different wars. And when we come
here, we have already small town, and now we hear that on
the map it say it's splitting and this is getting
smaller, so we are not really happy. And please consider
that.

Continue to keep (indiscernible) where we have --
and we have (indiscernible) and it will really grow,
growing so fast and beautiful in Long Beach. So please keep the way it is and continue to add more technology and economics and religion work together as a whole.

Thank you so much, Madam Chair, and all the hard work from the Commission. I really appreciate it. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 6456, and up next after that will be Caller 9400.

Caller 6456, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? And one more time, Caller 6456, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? I do apologize, Caller 6456. There appears to be some connectivity issue. If we have time, I will try to come back.

At this time, we will be going to Caller 9400, and up next after that will be Caller 1986.

Caller 9400, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MS. GIUMARRA: Yes. Thank you so much for taking my comments. My name is Cynthia Giumarra. It's G-I-U-M-A-R-R-A. I'm a resident in Bakersfield, California. I wanted to address the map of Madera-Kern 1102. I appreciate your efforts to bring equity across our state in how various districts are lined out.
I would ask, though, that with regard to Fresno County and Kern County, that we make no changes. These two communities are uniquely situated with different major business interests and various historical and civic-social interests. They have things that are unique to each county, and I believe that keeping the representation and the district lines as they're currently drawn would be the most efficient and effective way of giving the constituents in these counties the representation that they need because of the uniqueness that we find in these two communities.

I know especially in Kern County -- and this has been brought up on earlier comments today -- we have a unique medical need in our county that deals with Valley fever. It's also been brought up that we're uniquely situated with major oil interests, with agriculture, and also with cattle and dairy farming. So I'm just asking that you would not change those district lines --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. GIUMARRA: -- between Fresno County and Bakersfield or Kern County, that it would be most effective to keep them drawn as they're currently drawn so that it would meet the needs that the constituents in these counties have most effectively. So thank you for your time, and --
MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. GIUMARRA: -- I wish you all the very best in this major effort. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 1986, and up next after that will be Caller 5944.

Caller 1986, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? And one more time, caller with the last four digits 1986, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six? I do apologize, Caller 1986. If we have time, I will attempt to come back. There appears to be some connectivity issues with you unmuting.

Right now, we have Caller 5944, and up next after that will be Caller 1473.

Caller 5944, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi, good evening, commissioners. I wanted to correct the record about something that came up in the meeting this morning. The dollop in the Kern County-Bakersfield district that goes into Delano, Bakersfield, and whatnot was described as being part of the three conditions VRA area. And that dollop is -- was actually expanded in the visualizations quite a bit last week to take up another 150,000 people, and really,
that's kind of what's driving this whole issue with having a district that is connected to Fresno. That's why that population had to shift north. So the existing district lines would put that 150,000 people back where they were.

You know, we've heard a lot of (indiscernible) testimony from -- you know, it's been bipartisan, multiracial, from a lot of community leaders, elected down here -- about that district. It's very unwieldy, and I don't think that you could have, well, really a district like that with -- result in about seventy-five percent of the people there never having a chance to have any local representation. There's just no center to it, and it just doesn't make sense --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MALE SPEAKER: -- for the people that live there. I would hope that you guys would apply the same standards that you have to other places. We hear a lot in other districts when you're discussing other areas about spheres of influence and --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MALE SPEAKER: -- anchor cities and that sort of thing, and it seems like in regards to this particular district, that's kind of gone out the window. So I would hope that you guys kind of reassess that. Thank you very
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we have Caller 1473, and up next after that will be Caller 5042.

Caller 1473, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six?

MS. WALSH: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. The floor is yours.

MS. WALSH: Good evening. My name is Susan Walsh, and I am calling from Merced, California. And along with many of the other callers, I first want to say thank you to the Commission. The work you are doing is critical to democracy and critical to the future of California, and it's also mind-bending. So I appreciate all your efforts.

I'm calling to ask that Merced County remain in one congressional district. Merced County is a resource-poor county, and over the last decade, we have been able to pull together because of our common economic, historical, water, ecology, and educational communities. As an earlier caller mentioned, we have -- we are lucky enough to be the home of the tenth campus of the University of California in Merced, but our community college, which serves thousands of students, operates across the county in both the east and west sides in Merced and Los Banos.
with other places between. I sit on the citizen advisory committee for the (indiscernible) people here -- sorry about the dog -- and I also sit on other county-wide committees, including for the League of Women Voters and --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. WALSH: -- and for the county library system. I urge you not to separate Merced County and to let us continue to have the political representation we need to forge a path --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. WALSH: -- (indiscernible) economic growth of the counties north and south of us. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have Caller 5042, and up next after that will be Caller 4340.

We do have a break coming up in about ten minutes, but I would like to give those who have not spoke this evening the opportunity to please press star nine to raise your hand, indicating you do wish to give comment this evening as we are coming to the end of our queue. Again, star nine will raise your hand, indicating you have a comment to make. I see those hands coming up, and thank you so much.

Right now, we have Caller 5042. If you will please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello? Can you hear me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Perfect. Hi, everybody. My name is Claire, and I'd like to make a public comment on Kings County. Many Kings County students attend West Hills Community College after graduating high school, which has campuses in Kings, Tulare, and Fresno County. Far more students from Kings County attend Fresno State than Cal State, Bakersfield.

And also, Kings County is a former Section 5 county and should be kept whole out of the deference to the -- that former student. It's a protected county out of the -- by the Voting Rights Act.

And thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 4340, and up next after that will be Caller 6666.

Caller 4340, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MS. LADDISH: Thank you. My name is Kate Laddish, K-A-T-E L-A-D-D-I-S-H. I live in the Yolo County city of Winters along the Yolo-Solano line and near Napa. Thank you to commissioners and line-drawers for hearing public
input about the previous congressional and senate visualizations and reorienting Yolo County so we're -- so we are grouped with Solano in the northern part of the Delta rather than with counties along the Oregon and Nevada borders.

The current congressional and senate visualizations are significant improvements, and -- although we are still put in the assembly visualization. Through this process, there's been an oft-repeated refrain of keep Yolo County whole and group Yolo and Solano together.

There's also been significant public input about keeping the greater Winters area and Yolo, Solano, and Napa together.

Looking at the current congressional visualization, I'm delighted that all of Yolo County is included in VCD_CONCORD_TR 1102. I very much appreciate that the Yolo and Solano parts of the Winters area are together in this district. This district with Yolo, eastern Solano, and the Delta parts of Sacramento and Contra Costa reflects our shared interest in the Delta. Winters and other Yolo County and Solano communities feel this kinship with Vacaville in Solano County, which is not included in this district. I would like to see Vacaville moved into Concord TR.

And turning to the senate, I like how Yolo is
grouped with Napa County, much of Solano, the Delta
portions of Sacramento, as well as Lake County --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. LADDISH: -- in VSD Napa Byron 1102. However,
I'm quite concerned that west Sacramento is in N Sac
1102. Please move west Sacramento into Napa Byron. Yolo
County is a community of interest and should be kept
whole --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. LADDISH: -- in district. Similarly, please
unite Yolo in future assembly visualizations, grouping us
with Solano, Sacramento, Delta (indiscernible) and Napa.
Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have Caller 6666, and up next after that
will be Caller 8809.

Caller 6666, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MS. SAN: Good evening, commissioners. My name is
Sithea San, and I am the chairman and executive director
of Cambodia Town, Inc. I called in a few weeks ago to
oppose maps that would have separated the Cambodian
community from Long Beach. Today, I am calling to share
that the Cambodian community will always oppose maps that
propose to split us apart, as the map the Commission
released this week would have done.

Thank you so much, commissioners, for hearing our comments. The whole of the Cambodian community in Long Beach wants to be with Long Beach. Long Beach is a diversity, and our Cambodian community is a proud partner on a lot of the work that is done by so many good people all around us in Long Beach. We have made a conscious effort to organize and elevate Cambodian voices in politics, education, and civic engagement, and have established ourselves as equal members of the entire Long Beach community.

Our progress has only been possible through the hard work of our own community members and through recognition and respect from others --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SAN: -- in the entire Long Beach community.

Thank you for keeping the Cambodian community together in Long Beach, and have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now will be Caller 8809.

Caller 8809, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute? And the floor is yours.

MS. WARMSLEY: Thank you, Madam Secretary. This is Councilwoman Kimberly Warmsley for the -- from the 6th District in Stockton, California. I'm calling on behalf
of myself and my constituents in regards to the congressional district -- my district.

First of all, I want to point out that VCD 1102 leaves out the rest of the Delta and Stockton, a most vulnerable and historically marginalized city. Stockton is the tenth-most-diverse community in the nation with one of the strongest agriculture economies in the world. It is vital we protect our Delta and the surrounding neighborhoods and cities throughout this district. This map is not reflective of its jewel.

I want to point out VCDA Map 1013. I find this map very lucrative, and the reason that I support this alignment is because it benefits and unifies not all but -- not some but all of the neighborhoods within the San Joaquin Delta, including Stockton, a very unique and diverse community. The commonalities that we have within the San Joaquin County Delta must continue to preserve in our waterways, agriculture land, schools, especially hos -- hospitals, including our new veterans' facility and the San Joaquin County General Hospital, which offers a trauma clinic.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. WARMSLEY: Remember, this region is key to our most precious assets within the State of California, which is the San Joaquin Delta. In close, I want to just
point out that Elk Grove needs to be aligned with congressional districts in Sacramento because, again, it shares its commonalities --

MALE SPEAKER: Ten seconds.

MS. WARMSLEY: -- with Sacramento and not San Joaquin County. Please consider maybe branching off and expanding into Lodi and French Camp --

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Katy. Thank you, callers. We're on a break -- we're coming up on a break. So we're going to take a fifteen-minute break, and when we come back, we will finish hearing our public comment from those that are in the queue.

So, Katy, if you could give the raise hand instruction, we will go to break at 6:30. I'll give you a little bit of time here to give that instruction.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: For those that have called in (indiscernible) this evening, if you'll please press star nine to raise your hand, indicating you wish to give comment. And for those that have not been able to connect before, I will come back and retry those numbers. That is for Caller 1986 and Caller 6456 and Caller 7604. And for everybody, please do not hang up as our lines are closed. So please do not hang up, and we will be back. Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Katy.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You're welcome.

CHAIR LE MONS: Let's go to break, Kristian.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you so much. We are on break until 6:45, everybody.

(Off the record at 6:30 p.m.)

(On the record at 6:44 p.m.)

CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back, everyone, from break.

At this time, we'll go back to our public comment.

Katy?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair.

And we'll start with Caller 7839, and up after that will be Caller 1986. But before I do that, I would like to give Caller 5956, Caller 6456, Caller 6751, Caller 7604, and Caller 8775 -- if you will please press star nine to raise your hand, indicating you wish to give comment, it will make my job a little bit easier. I will still be giving you an opportunity to speak. It makes it a little more fluid. Star nine, again, would help a lot.

Right now, Caller 7839, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening. Thank you so much for listening to my comments. I also would like to agree with all the previous callers in thanking you for all your hard work that -- that you (indiscernible) to make
this process work.

My name is Daphne Balsimore (ph.), and I've lived in Simi Valley for thirty years. My comments deal with -- I would like to see -- I'd like to see you keep Simi Valley and Santa Clarita County together in the same assembly, senate, and congressional districts. We have similar shared characteristics and issues, including we're communities of working class people; we share wildfire, water, and energy grid issues. And I also want to share that I support the BICA-AD38 assembly map.

Thank you so much for your time. I really appreciate it, and I hope that you can keep Simi Valley and Santa Clarita together. Thank you, thank you. Have a fantastic evening. Good-bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll retry Caller 1986, and up after that will be Caller 9918.

Caller 1986, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Alyssa (ph.). I'd like to make a public comment on Kings and Kern County. The Kern River is a natural dividing line between east and west Bakersfield. The communities on the west side of the Kern, including all the way up to Kings, Fresno, and Tulare, share similar water conditions. On one side
of the river, they pump groundwater, and on the other, they utilize surface water. Given the centrality of water to everyday life in the valley, that differentiation is critical to recognize in districting. Thank you for your continued work on the maps.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll be going to Caller 9918, and up next after that will be Caller 3082.

Caller 9918, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Good evening, everyone. Good evening, Commission. I thank you for all of your hard work during this time of redrawing lines in the districts. But I did have one concern.

As a member of the community who lives in, works in, and works closely with the Latino community, I have a concern that their vote is being split up into multiple districts as the constituents all live in one primary area of Fresno. So I would like to see a VRA congressional seat in Fresno, and I would like to see possibly a line drawn through Fresno somewhere, you know, west of 99 and south of Shaw. I think that's going to increase the Latino vote in that area and keep everyone together as their cultural concerns are very similar. I think it would be unfair to keep them split up.
Thank you for your time. I appreciate all of your hard work. I know it's not easy in this time, and I know you guys have a really hard job. But thank you for hearing my concerns tonight.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we'll be going to Caller 3082, and up next after that, we'll be going to Caller 5956.

Caller 3082, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? The floor is yours. Caller 3082, you are unmuted. Can you hear me? You may want to double-check to make sure your phone is not on mute. Oh, now you are muted again. There you are, unmuted. The floor is yours. And once again, you might just want to double-check that your phone is not on mute. Caller 30 -- can you hear us now? Caller 3082? I do apologize for your technical difficulties. I will come back to you in just a couple of more speakers.

Right now, we will be giving Caller 5956 an opportunity. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six? And just one more time, Caller 5956, if you wish to give comment, please press star six. And as you have not raised your hand, I will not waste our time any longer.

And up next after that, we will be giving Caller 6456 another opportunity as you had your hand raised.
earlier and were unable to unmute. That's Caller 6456. If you wish to give comment and try one more time, please press star six. And one more time, Caller 6456, if you wish to try again and give comment, please press star six. Thank you, Caller 6456. I apologize if you are trying to unmute, and please contact the Commission in the other ways available.

At this time, we will go to Caller 6751. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six if you wish to give comment this evening? And one more time, Caller 6751, if you wish to give comment, please press star six. Clearly, you do not.

I believe Caller 3082 is our last retry. Caller 3082, if you will please press star six?

MR. SMART: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

MR. SMART: Can you hear me now?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MR. SMART: Well, after four hours, I'm glad. I'm Pastor William Smart, president and CEO of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference of Southern California. I want to thank you all for hearing the voices and concerns of African American community in Los Angeles. We appreciate that you drew senate and congressional
seats that would continue to allow our community an
opportunity to elect candidates of our choice. I look
forward to working with you as we go into line drawing to
make these the strongest African American VRA districts
possible.

However, my community still has concerns about your
assembly visualizations. I request that you work to make
these districts -- draft districts more sensitive to the
African American community before you enter the live
line-drawing phase. I recognize that Los Angeles is a
large, complex region, and you are hearing from many
individuals, groups, and organizations throughout this
process. Please continue to keep the needs of African
American communities in the Los Angeles Basin in mind
when you revisit the assembly visualization.

We are SCLC. We fought for the 1955 Voting Rights
Act. We are Martin Luther King's organization. We are
watching, working all throughout this space, the city,
the county, to ensure that there is Voting Rights
districts and that we are represented as a people and not
negated in this process. Thank you for your hard, hard
work, because you have --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. SMART: -- really shown that you work hard.

Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And I do want to give Caller 8775 an opportunity to unmute. If you wish to give comment, Caller 8775, please press star six to unmute at this time. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm just calling to urge the Commission to ensure a strong Voting Rights district in the community of Fresno. The proposed maps are really detrimental to the Hispanic and Latino voices in Fresno, and I just urge the Commission to relook at drawing those lines for the sake of equity in that area. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And Chair, that is all of our callers this -- this evening.

Chair, I believe you are on mute.

COMMISSIONERS FORNACIARI: You're muted.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you so much, Katy, appreciate it, and I'm happy to say that we were able to get through all of our callers again this evening. We appreciate the feedback. If for some reason you had technical difficulty and was unable to get your comment in, please visit our website at WeDrawTheLines.ca.org. Use the form, and you can still provide your comment at any time.

So again, thank you so much. We had some robust -- excuse me -- public comment over the last three days. I want to thank all the commissioners, the staff, the line drawers, and everyone who helps to make these meetings
successful for the -- excuse me -- residents of California. It has been a pleasure to serve as the chair this week, and I look forward to passing the baton to Commissioners Turner and Taylor for next week and to continue to do the great work for the citizens of California.

So with that, we are going to say goodnight, just under 7 o'clock. The meeting is adjourned.

(Recessed at 6:57 p.m.)
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